

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 001

95

UD 017 895

AUTHOR Pettigrew, Thomas F.; Kipp, Rae Cecilia
TITLE Community Case Studies on School Desegregation.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington,
D.C.
PUB DATE 15 Jul 77
GRANT NIE-P-77-0140
NOTE 114p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bibliographies; *Case Studies; *Community Study;
Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria;
Public Schools; Research Methodology; *Research
Reviews (Publications); Research Utilization; *School
Integration

ABSTRACT

Though it has been a much publicized national process for a full generation, racial desegregation of the public schools has not received sustained and rigorous evaluation. This report is an attempt to assess the quality and characteristics of community oriented case studies on school desegregation. The search strategy for accessibility and criteria set for appropriateness of case studies are described. Critical reviews are presented of eleven studies. Based on the bibliographical search and case study reviews, it is concluded that although a number of community studies on public school desegregation exist, they consist predominantly of descriptive reports of widely varying quality. The few research oriented studies found are strongest in the comparative criteria concerned with an adequate political perspective, a focus upon integration, and attention to the multilevel nature of the desegregation process. They are weakest in such criteria as an adequate quasi-experimental design and attention to differential effects across different aggregate units. Focusing on these conclusions, suggestions are offered for future and higher quality community school desegregation studies. An extensive bibliography, a list of case studies in progress, and a list of forty communities which have experienced school desegregation are appended to this report. (Author/GC)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

FD149001

Community Case Studies on School Desegregation

Thomas F. Pettigrew

Rae Cecilia Kipp

National Institute of Education Grant
NIE-P-77-0140

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Contractor: Beacon Press
25 Beacon Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

July 15, 1977

UDD017895

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iv
Part I - Introduction	1
Part II - The Comparative Criteria	9
Part III - Search Strategy for Accessible Community Case Studies on School Desegregation/Integration	21
Part IV - Analysis of Case Studies With Some Research Strength	41
Part V - Conclusions on the State of the Art of Community Case Studies	67
Bibliographies	83
A. Bibliography of Works Cited	84
B. Community Case Studies With Some Research Strength	86
C. Descriptive Community Case Studies	89
D. Bibliographic Resources	93
E. In-House Community Case Studies	95
Appendices	97
Appendix I - The Comparative Criteria	98
Appendix II - Case Studies in Process	99
Appendix III - Forty Communities Which Have Experienced School Desegregation	101
Appendix IV - Comments by Advisory Committee Members	105

LIST OF CHARTS

	Page
Chart 1 - Computer Search Chart	25
Chart 2 - Criteria Pattern of Community Case Studies with Some Research Strength	30
Chart 3 - Range of Criteria for Community Case Studies with Some Research Strength	31
Chart 4 - Criteria Pattern of Descriptive Community Case Studies	32
Chart 5 - Range of Criteria for Descriptive Community Case Studies	35
Chart 6 - Coverage of Communities	37

PREFACE

This feasibility study of community case studies on school desegregation was carried out under Grant NIE-P-77-0140 from the National Institute of Education. The contractor and administrator of the grant was Beacon Press. The opinions herein expressed, however, are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of either the National Institute of Education or Beacon Press.

The study is a collaborative effort by the authors with much interaction. However, Thomas F. Pettigrew developed the comparative criteria, evolved the rationale for community case studies, and evaluated the research-oriented studies. He also formulated the conclusions on the state of the art community case studies on school desegregation and made recommendations for the future strengthening of such studies. Rae Cecilia Kipp designed the search strategy, conducted the search, summarized the procedures, and prepared the charts which illustrate the search findings. The Advisory Committee on Feasibility of Community Case Studies on School Integration critiqued the criteria and thoroughly discussed the body of the report in several committee sessions with the authors and Beacon Press. Some of the committee members have submitted

a formal precis of their comments to be included in Appendix IV.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
FEASIBILITY OF COMMUNITY CASE STUDIES
ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Gregory R. Anrig--Commissioner of Education, Commonwealth
of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts

Ann Fisher--Editor, Partner of Brochures Unlimited

J. Harold Flannery--Lawyer, Foley, Hoag & Eliot, Boston,
Massachusetts, Counsel on Boston Case

Ellen Jackson--Director, Freedom House Institute on Schools
and Education, Roxbury, Massachusetts

Rae Cecilia Kipp--General Editor, Former Chairman of Massa-
chusetts State Board of Education

Sandra Lynch--General Counsel, Massachusetts Department of
Education

Meyer Weinberg--Publisher of Integrated Education magazine,
Northwestern University

I

INTRODUCTION

Racial desegregation of the public schools, though a much-publicized national process for a full generation, has not received sustained and rigorous evaluation. Even the U.S. Office of Education's Equal Education Opportunity Survey ("the Coleman Report"), which triggered the era of large-scale evaluations of federal programs, did not focus specifically on racial desegregation (Coleman et al., 1966).

Of the many reasons for this glaring deficiency, two major ones deserve mention. First, the racial controversial, and highly political history. This is, of course, not the ideal climate for serious research. It meant in the 1950s and early 1960s a paucity of both private and public funds to conduct competent evaluations of the process (Cook, 1957; Pettigrew, 1961). And it has sometimes meant highly selective and politically motivated "analyses." Second, a sustained and rigorous evaluation of a national process as varied and complex as school desegregation is extremely difficult; some reasonably argue that it is impossible. We shall see reasons for this in the next section.

Broadly speaking, there have been two contrasting approaches to the evaluation of social programs. One

involves massive national studies funded by the federal government to evaluate federal programs. The other embraces numerous community studies done separately by a great variety of investigators using virtually the entire spectrum of methods. Each approach has its advantages and disadvantages.

National Studies

The Coleman Report, with its over 600,000 student respondents and its huge regression analyses, ushered in the era of massive national evaluations. The advantages claimed for this approach include probability coverage of the entire program, standardization of methods and design, and the establishment of a "map" of the program's structure and diversity. Moreover, despite intense criticism of some of these large studies, they can often attract more sophisticated, experienced researchers than low-budget, local studies.

Nonetheless, the past decade has taught us some of the disadvantages of this broadside approach. National evaluations require widespread cooperation, and often suffer heavy nonresponse rates with distinct biases. For example, the Coleman Report experienced several sample losses in the urban North and rural South--precisely the school systems then under the strongest pressures to

desegregate. Later criticism, too, can always be directed at the adequacy and scope of the uniform research methods and design; standardization of approach turns out to be a mixed blessing. Often, too, the gross national study has failed to capture the critical differences between administrations of the same program in diverse social settings.

This lack of fine-grain detail relates to another liability. "The total-effect fallacy," while not inherent to this approach, has typified many of these national studies to date. The typical questions addressed are: Did "it" work? What was "the program's" total effect? The inappropriateness of these questions becomes apparent as soon as we consider the variegated nature of such nationwide programs as Head Start and public school desegregation. There is no one desegregation program as such; indeed, the enormous variance across individual school systems--even schools within the same system--means that there are almost as many forms of school desegregation as there are desegregating schools. Without denying that there should be some common threads running across these diverse situations, it is still not surprising that large evaluation studies that look for a simple "total effect" across a range of contrasting projects have rarely found these common threads.

Rather than search unrealistically for large "total effects" of variegated programs, these same evaluation

studies could be more usefully asking: Which types of individual projects "succeeded" on a range of dependent variables? Which "failed"? And what are the differences between these types of projects? This reconceptualization of evaluation is more appropriate than the "total effect" approach to both the reality of these national programs and to the power of our currently available research methods. Moreover, these questions yield more information and present more options to policy makers.

Community Studies

The advantages and disadvantages of community-based evaluation studies complement those of national studies. The two approaches together should be mutually reinforcing and provide maximum confidence in the results. In practice, however, neither of the approaches to the evaluation of school desegregation has advanced to the point where this ideal situation exists. A few generalizations can be gleaned from research performed at both the national and local levels, and they will be emphasized in the conclusions of this report. But such convergence is still the exception, not the rule.

The major advantage of work done at the community level is that a fine-grain analysis is possible, an analysis informed by the political climate and other particulars special

to the local situation. Response rates are more variable than those of national studies. They can potentially be higher in well-conducted longitudinal community studies, though intolerably low response rates have occurred in a few studies (e.g., Armor, 1972; Pettigrew et al., 1973). Typically, good community studies in school desegregation investigate a broader range of dependent variables than national studies, though they usually share the national bias toward placing primary emphasis on achievement test score shifts. Consequently, community studies are somewhat less prone to commit "the total-effect fallacy."

The major disadvantages often involve less sophisticated research methods and designs, less experienced researchers, and less national perspective within which to interpret the findings. These problems are sometimes made worse by low budgets and by intense pressures to obtain the politically "right" results. Indeed, some community investigations, often performed as in-house demonstrations by school systems themselves, do not qualify as "research" in any sense commonly recognized in social science and will not be discussed in the report.

Community studies employ a great variety of methods and designs, and this variety has both negative and positive implications. The conventional reaction of social scientists is to decry the lack of standardization in

approach across studies. When conflicting findings arise from two studies using different methods, how can one determine whether the findings reflect simply the method differences or a genuine failure to replicate?

Donald Campbell (1975, 1977), a respected and thoughtful commentator on evaluation research, answers this question by simply advocating many more additional studies along similar lines. He advances an interesting view that counters the conventional wisdom concerning the need for uniformity of methods and design. Long a proponent of multitrait, multimethod research approaches (Campbell and Fiske, 1959), Campbell distrusts a single, massive national evaluation study that may unduly narrow the problem and the methods utilized. Replication with many methods in diverse settings is essential.

Too many social scientists expect single experiments to settle issues once and for all. This may be a mistaken generalization from the history of great crucial experiments in physics and chemistry. In actuality the significant experiments in the physical sciences are replicated thousands of times. . . . Because we social sciences have less ability to achieve "experimental isolation," because we have good

reason to expect our treatment effects to interact significantly with a wide variety of social factors many of which we have not yet mapped, we have much greater needs for replication experiments than do the physical sciences (Campbell, 1975, p. 97).

Consequently, Campbell recommends that evaluations, even of national programs, be conducted on a "cottage-industry model" consisting of multiple and divergent small studies (Campbell, 1977). He regards this model as not only congruent with the principal advances in the history of science, but as logically following from his social evolutionary perspective on science and epistemological problems in general. The cottage-industry approach, as opposed to the single-shot, national study, maximizes variation, selection, and retention of replicated findings--the three key evolutionary processes (Campbell, 1977).

Cambell's cottage-industry model of program evaluation provides one of the strongest arguments for the potential value of variegated community studies of the racial desegregation of the nation's public schools--the focus of this report. His model would acquire special force (1) if it were applied systematically, and (2) if the studies met reasonably rigorous research criteria. The first of these

conditions has not been the case to date. The second is one of the chief questions to which this report is addressed. So we turn now to the research criteria which this report will apply to the available community studies of school desegregation.

II

THE COMPARATIVE CRITERIA

Our work was initiated with the expectation that many useful community studies had been conducted on school desegregation, though their quality and accessibility had to be determined. In order assess the studies' quality, to compare them, and to determine how nearly they approach Campbell's cottage-industry ideal, we need a set of comparative criteria by which to judge each study. We fully recognize in advance that not all of the investigations, indeed not even many of the investigations, would meet more than a few of these criteria. But we regarded it as an advantage to set rigorous standards that are known to relate to policy useful information in other domains. Such criteria can more accurately tell us how far these community studies have come and how far they have yet to go to be maximally informative.

The criteria were put in the form of eight questions and asked of each of the community studies reviewed:

1. Does the study employ a "reasonable" research design of either an experimental or quasi-experimental nature?
2. Does the study emphasize process rather than simple static phenomena?

- A. Is the study overtime in nature?
 - B. Does the study focus on issues of integration in addition to mere mix and desegregation?
3. Does the study utilize a variety of outcome measures (i.e., dependent variables) rather than one outcome--such as achievement-test score changes?
 4. Does the study emphasize complex and diverse effects of disaggregated sub-units (e.g., classroom or schools) as opposed to "total effects" of the entire program?
 5. Does the study reflect an appreciation of the multilevel nature of public education--the community, the school system, the school, the classroom, and, finally, the individual student?
 6. Is there any attempt--even if crude, speculative, and tentative--to employ causal analysis (if at all warranted by the research design)?
 7. Does the study provide any political perspective on the process of racial desegregation in the particular community? And, if not, would it be possible to obtain it now after the fact?
 8. Finally, if a particular study does not reflect any of these comparative criteria, what criteria does it reflect and what do they still contribute to the "state of the art" of community investigations on school desegregation?

Each of these eight criteria requires brief discussion.

1. A "Reasonable" Research Design

A true experimental design, with its characteristic randomization across control and test units, is something to be sought but not expected in this realm. School administration in general and desegregation plans in particular typically rule out this ideal approach of the laboratory. But

the development of numerous quasi-experimental designs by Campbell and Stanley (1966) and others in recent years for use in such field situations provide useful, second-choice options for conscientious investigators. Even here, however, we will have to be flexible in our application of this criteria; hence, our use of the adjective "reasonable."

This criterion is not invoked as a mere instrument of precision or as a methodologist's compulsion. For program evaluation to be of value to policy makers, it must obviously be trustworthy. This practical need translates into a research design that is relatively free from gross problems of internal and external invalidity. Campbell (1975) provides a convenient summary of the most important of these invalidating factors. Sources of internal invalidity, he notes, include:

1. History (Nontreatment events between pretest and posttest can provide alternative explanations of effects.)
2. Maturation (Growth, fatigue, secular trends, and other intra-unit changes can provide alternative explanations of effects.)
3. Instability (Unreliable measures and sampling fluctuations produce error.)
4. Testing (Initial testing or publication of results influences later testing.)

5. Instrumentation (Changes in instrumentation calibration, scores employed, or observers can produce artifactual "effects.")
6. Regression effects (The selection of extreme units as either experimentals or controls can produce either false positive or false negative "effects." For a classic demonstration of how this operated to make Head Start programs look harmful, see Campbell and Erlebacher, 1970.)
7. Selection (Differential recruitment of experimental and control groups produces effects.)
8. Selection/Maturation interaction (Selection biases (#7) can result in differential rates of maturation (#2) between the experimental and the control groups.)
9. Experimental mortality (Differential dropout rates in the control and experimental groups can also bias the results.)

Examples of how these factors can affect desegregation studies abound. The tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in April of 1968, for instance, triggered racial tensions, and served as a "historical source of invalidity" (#1) that distorted school studies underway at the time. Perhaps, selection problems (#7) are the most difficult

to deal with in educational research (Pettigrew, 1969). Students in various schools, programs, and classrooms are rarely randomly assorted, though these aggregated units are the most convenient to investigate.

Campbell (1975) also lists a variety of sources of external validity. These include such problems as the artificiality of the experimental conditions (the so-called "Hawthorne effects") and the interference of multiple treatments. The latter source of invalidity is often involved in desegregation research. It refers to the danger that when multiple treatments are simultaneously applied, the effects may be sharply different from those resulting from the separate application of the treatments. And desegregation as a "treatment" is seldom applied without other major changes simultaneously occurring in the schools; indeed, one of the typical benefits of school desegregation is that it provides a rationale for introducing many other sweeping educational reforms. From an educational perspective, these additional changes are to be welcomed and encouraged. From an evaluation perspective, these changes make it virtually impossible to isolate the "pure" effects of desegregation apart from those of the additional treatments.

In their classic monograph on research designs, Campbell and Stanley (1966) reject as inadequate three designs that

are all too common in educational studies; the one-group, one-shot design; the one-group, pretest-posttest design; and the two-group, posttest-only design. They describe ten different basic quasi-experimental designs that protect against many of the sources of invalidity mentioned above. These designs generally include relevant control comparisons (these may be rendered by samples of time or stimulus materials as well as groups of subjects) and measures both before and after the intervention under study (multiple measures both before and after are especially helpful). We began our search and analysis of community studies with these two minimal standards--controls with overtime measures--as our definition of a "reasonable" research design. However, this criterion was to be applied only to the "harder" research efforts of a study, not to its general descriptions provided of such matters as the political climate.

Search Note. In practice we had to make our judgments lenient and flexible. For example, early in the search we divided cases into cases with some research strength and descriptive cases. The search was conducted by a professional librarian, not a research sociologist. Therefore, our search judgments rested on a general research background. The presence

of some criteria, or the use of criteria in some degree, was taken to warrant the inclusion of a community case study. Our intent was to have rigorous standards which determined the state of the art. Then we applied them with an open attitude which would permit the evaluation of the whole range of community case studies. Even with this tolerant approach, only two of the eleven studies with research strength were fully quasi-experimental; three were partially; and none of them were experimental. Only two descriptive case studies were found to be even partly quasi-experimental.

2. An Emphasis on Process

Understanding the dynamic processes of school desegregation is far more important than static description of the phenomenon. Consequently, we searched for community studies that emphasized process. Such studies would of necessity be overtime in design and focus upon issues of genuine racial integration in addition to mere racial mix and desegregation.

Search Note. Process was interpreted in the broadest sense. A study was considered overtime in nature if it were longitudinal or if the study framework were overtime in overtime in nature, or if there were a repeated search period at a later date. A partial focus on integration

was considered acceptable. Five studies with research strength were overtime in nature; three were partially so. Two descriptive studies, and four in part, could also be so described. Integration was emphasized in seven of the eleven studies with research strength. Three descriptive cases shared this emphasis.

3. A Variety of Outcome Measures

Equal educational opportunity, the oft-stated goal of racial desegregation of the public schools, includes far more than just achievement-test score gains. It involves a broad preparation for an interracial world, a chance for continued education, and in general direct inclusion of minority children into the nation's "network of influence" through which most white Americans have traditionally benefited. Yet evaluation studies of school desegregation have focused, often exclusively, upon achievement-test changes. Thus, we wish to take special notice of those investigations that measured an array of relevant outcome indicators.

Search Note. Studies which examined more than one facet or outcome were included even though they did not encompass a wide variety of outcome measures. One study on achievement alone by Kurtz (1975) was added because it was overtime in nature. Only five of the eleven studies, with three in part, with

research strength contain a variety of outcome measures. One descriptive study, and one partially, can be so described.

4. An Emphasis upon Complex and Diverse Effects

As discussed earlier, studies that report only gross "total effects" are far less informative than those that look more closely for differential desegregation effects across classrooms and schools within a single district. Instead simply of asking, "Did it work?" in the aggregate, more useful research finds out where it "worked," where it did not, and the systematic differences between these two types of settings. We realized that such investigations may be unusual; but, if we were to uncover them in our bibliographical search, we wanted to denote them carefully.

Search Note. An open approach to complex and diverse effects stretched this criterion to encompass fully three of the eleven studies with research strength and five to a degree. It also allowed the tentative inclusion of three descriptive studies. This criterion was not met by the majority of case studies.

5. A Multilevel Analysis

The Coleman Report (Coleman et al., 1966) taught educational researchers to be sensitive to the complex, multilevel

nature of schooling. The community, the school system, the school, the classroom, and the individual student are all important units for analysis of the complexities of the desegregation process. It is unrealistic, of course, to expect any single investigation to study in depth more than two or three levels; most work at only one level. But community studies that report findings at more than a single level are more valuable and hence worth noting.

Search Note. Multilevel analysis was noted in both cases with research strength and descriptive cases. If more than one level was examined, the study was presumed to be multilevel in some degree. Seven of the eleven cases with research strength paid attention to multilevel analysis and four to an extent. Three descriptive cases took this criterion into consideration and three more did so partially.

6. Some Attempt at Causal Analysis

In a realm as politicized as school desegregation, most research findings are interpreted by nonresearchers in direct, causal terms. So we wish to take note of any community studies under review that undertook any causal analysis themselves. Even if crude, speculative, and tentative, any causal analysis warranted by the research design is a

vast improvement over loose popular reasoning. We were aware that this comparative criterion was unlikely to be met by many community studies. "Cause" is a difficult concept, and it is even more difficult to determine with social data.

Search Note. Causal analysis was broadly interpreted to cover any serious attempt to answer the question "why?" on the basis of the data. Even with this latitude for inclusion, only six of the case studies with some research strength approach speculative or tentative causal analysis, while four do so partly. Three descriptive cases do attempt such analysis while two do so to a degree.

7. Political Perspective

That Atlanta in the deep South could accept school desegregation peacefully while Boston in the far North resisted it violently cannot be understood without some knowledge of the contrasting political climates of the two cities. Though it might well be purely descriptive, the political context within which the interracial drama of the schools is played out is a necessary component of a well-rounded community study. If such political information is currently missing from the research report, we also tried to determine if it could be obtained retrospectively.

Search Note. Political perspective was more prevalent in the case studies of both types. Seven, and three partially, of the eleven case studies with some research strength focused attention on the political process and climate. Seven of the descriptive studies, and two in part, gave some attention to political perspective.

8. A Study's Additional Contributions

Finally, we employed a miscellaneous category in order to record for each community study its particular strengths not tapped by our seven previous comparative criteria. We realized that our other criteria were highly desirable, but, perhaps, too rigorous for the large majority of community studies on desegregation. Hence, we did not wish to ignore any special contributions made by these studies.

Search Note. The openness of the eighth criterion was designed to allow for the inclusion of descriptive cases of some merit. In practice, it did not reveal particular strengths beyond the "descriptive" element.

III

SEARCH STRATEGY FOR ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITY CASE STUDIES ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION/ITEGRATION

This feasibility study began with the basic assumption that many useful community case studies on school desegregation/integration were now available to researchers. An additional assumption of accessibility was required by the time constraints of the contract, which reduced the already tight schedule of three months to two months. Accessibility is also related to whether material was available to the general public. Therefore, the parameters of our search were governed by the phrase "accessible community case studies on school desegregation/integration."

A parameter implies inclusion and exclusion. We therefore wish to define our search strategy on these factors. Inclusion encompassed the community milieu of school desegregation/integration efforts to some degree and provided some sense of the political context and the political process in that community. Students, teachers, administrators, parents, leaders, and officials who were involved were considered an essential part of community case studies.

Exclusion applied to state studies, to single school or limited school studies, to one-facet studies (i.e., achievement tests), and to thesis studies which were not accessible.

Exceptions were made whenever a study of unusual strength appeared in the search. For example, Janet Ward Schofield's "Ethnographic Study of a 'Nearly Integrated' Urban Middle School" was overtime in nature, covered integration as well as desegregation, was quasi-experimental in part, and used causal analysis. Therefore, the quality of penetration raised it to the level of community insight. In addition, theses for which abstracts were available were listed if not evaluated. Nevertheless, the parameters were effective in excluding studies which did not reflect community experience with desegregation/integration implementation.

The criteria developed by Pettigrew were continually at hand in the search. The presence of any one or more criteria often brought studies to our full attention for evaluation. It was a decided research advantage to have criteria fully formulated prior to the search as well as for evaluation purposes. The state of the art of community case studies on school desegregation/integration was thus a present focus from the inception of the search.

Practical and modern library theory determined the approach to information resources. Computer search of various data bases, investigation of library collections and holdings, bibliographic sources for desegregation/integration literature were fundamental in our search. Before we began the search phase, we set up interviews in Washington,

D.C., with the staffs of the National Institute of Education, the Office of Education, and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to explore their contributions in this area.

Primarily, the interviews turned up a small group of community case studies in process and a larger group of monographs on case studies in the process of publication by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. Appendix II briefly notes such studies. Later computer search and utilization of library resources produced some earlier case studies conducted under the auspices of the National Institute of Education and the Office of Education.

Educational Research Information Center resources are available at the National Institute of Education Library. These resources were thoroughly examined during the Washington visit. The ERIC staff was consulted on various approaches to information retrieval in our area of concern. It became obvious that Gutman Library of Harvard University could provide the same sophisticated and effective research facilities. Since this would be nearer to Pettigrew for critique and direction, it was decided to conduct the remainder of the computer search at Gutman Library.

Computer Search

Three data bases--ERIC, Sociological Abstracts, and

Psychological Abstracts--were explored through eight approaches between May 16, 1977, and June 22, 1977. The expert advice of Gutman Library staff was available. The size of these resources, the length of their time coverage, and the type of approaches are as follows:

ERIC contains 275,000 items, dating from 1966 to the present, and it includes journal articles, documents, and books. Six approaches were used, based on a number of subject descriptors. When a sample of ten communities proved reasonably productive, an additional thirty communities was searched. The selected list of forty communities, which have experienced school desegregation/integration, is listed in Appendix III.

Sociological Abstracts contains 250,000 items, dating from 1967 to present. One approach was used based on subject descriptors and was not effective.

Psychological Abstracts contains 75,000 items, dating from 1963 to the present. One approach was made through subject descriptors and was nonproductive.

No time parameter was set for the search; however, it is apparent that the data bases were established in the early 1960s and mid-1960s. There is, thus an inevitable time parameter on the computer search. The following chart indicates the number of approaches and the items produced by the computer search.

CHART I
Computer Search

Data Base	Approaches		Abstracts	Useful
	Date	Descriptors		
<u>ERIC</u>				
1.	May 16, 1977	School Desegregation/ Integration --Case Studies, etc.	35	12
2.	June 2, 1977	School Desegregation/ Integration --Research Studies	37	13*
3.	June 2, 1977	School Desegregation/ Integration --Community, etc.	6	-
4.	June 2, 1977	School Desegregation/ Integration --Leadership, etc.	33	-
5.	June 10, 1977	Sample of 10 Communities --School Desegregation/ Integration, etc.	28	11**
6.	June 23, 1977	Sample of 30 Communities --School Desegregation/ Integration, etc.	52	15***
<u>Sociological Abstracts</u>				
7.	June 10, 1977	School Desegregation/ Integration --Case Studies --Research	18	-
<u>Psychological Abstracts</u>				
8.	June 10, 1977	School Desegregation/ Integration --Case Studies --Research Studies	1	-
TOTALS			210	51 (16 repeats)

* 5 repeats from May 16, 1977

** 2 repeats from June 10, 1977.

*** 9 repeats from June 23, 1977.

Search of Library Resources

The library collections and catalogs of Widner Library and Gutman Library of Harvard University have been thoroughly searched under subject headings and under names of known authors in the field of school integration. The National Institute of Education Library was also covered. The studies found have been limited in number. Again there tends to be an unplanned time parameter with only a few studies dated before the 1960s.

Periodical indexes were not searched separately, since the computer search covers journals. Nor was it expected that serious community case studies would be found in journals. Therefore, a further crosschecking of computer results was not considered essential.

Bibliographic Search

Nine bibliographies on school desegregation/integration were checked with somewhat limited results. Three of these were on microfiche and microfilm and covered theses. The abstracts of five theses were interesting, but these theses, though listed are not easily accessible. Three of Meyer Weinberg's bibliographic studies were checked and are listed, though only two were available. A group of basic authors and all books handled were searched for bibliographic references to community case studies. Bibliography D lists the major bibliographic sources.

Test for Search Strategy

The number of cases expected, due to the original assumption that "many useful community case studies on school desegregation had been conducted," did not appear in the search. Therefore, it was decided to verify the search strategy through Meyer Weinberg's files on school integration in Chicago.

Meyer Weinberg, editor and publisher of Integrated Education, has spent over a decade on the bibliography of school integration. He has been preparing, maintaining, and updating his files for ten years. A new edition of his 1967 bibliography, "School Integration: A Comprehensive Classified Bibliography," is due. The files in his offices at Northwestern University contain more than 5,000 items. They are classified under various subject headings, which include the names of the 50 states. There are also a third of a drawer on "integration effects" and another third on "community" topics. Just short of seven drawers, or some 3,000 items, were thoroughly searched to produce thirty-six probably useful studies, sixteen of them on microfiche.

Sixteen additional items appear to be in-house studies which have limited value for objective research. They are listed, but not evaluated, in Bibliography E for information purposes. Four studies were not located.

Of the sixteen microfiche studies, four were duplicates, eight were not within the search parameters, and four were useful. While many items found in the earlier search strategy were verified, little of obvious value was discovered. Only four minor studies were added to the descriptive studies. Therefore, the test of the search strategy was considered to be satisfactory confirmation of the search procedure.

Search Findings

We have been very gentle in keeping to the parameters, if a case study of merit appeared. The application of criteria to the findings has been continuous throughout the search. Although the criteria are rigorous, they have been broadly interpreted. Therefore, we do not believe we have excluded--or overlooked--any community case study of merit during the search. The basic assumption seems in doubt at this point.

Thousands of items have been checked by computer, by library catalog, and by bibliographic resources in the area. The large number of community case studies do not appear to be there, even if evaluation against criteria is not taken into consideration at this point in the search. There has been no problem in deciding whether to evaluate items. Whenever community case studies appeared, they

were carefully considered and evaluated. Rigorous criteria point the direction to stronger research, but they have not limited our consideration of interesting studies. We did divide "case studies with some research strength" from purely "descriptive studies." We evaluated both categories. From the perspective of the search, useful community case studies on school desegregation/integration are limited in number and they do not meet the full range of research criteria drawn up by Pettigrew.

The search findings are illustrated by the following five charts. Chart 2 records "the criteria pattern of community case studies with some research strength". In Chart 3 there is an analysis of the range of criteria in such cases for comparative purposes. Chart 4 indicates "the criteria pattern of descriptive community case studies". These cases also are analyzed for range of criteria in Chart 5. "The Coverage of Community Case Studies" in Chart 6 completes the picture of American communities which have been studied. The charts clarify the search strategy.

CHART 2

Criteria Pattern of Community
Case Studies with Some Research Strenght*

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
		A	B						
Bagwell Greensboro, NC Greenville, SC	0	0	-	0	-	1/2	1/2	+	Descriptive
Beker et al. northern city Syracuse, NY	1/2	+	+	+	1/2	+	+	+	Descriptive Research
Bonacich-Goodman Inglewood, CA	0	1/2	0	0	0	+	1/2	+	Descriptive with poli- tical focus
Crain 15 cities	0	1/2	0	-	0	1/2	+	+	Descriptive Research with poli- tical focus
Gerard and Miller Riverside, CA	1/2	+	1/2	+	+	1/2	+	0	Research
Gordon et al. Integration 6 communities	0	0	+	1/2	1/2	+	1/2	1/2	Descriptive
Gordon and Brownell 2 communities	0	0	+	1/2	1/2	+	0	+	Descriptive
**Hsia and Norton and Hsia Evanston, IL	+	+	+	+	1/2	+	1/2	1/2	Research
Mack 9 communities	0	1/2	+	1/2	1/2	+	+	+	Descriptive
Mayer Goldsboro, NC	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Descriptive Research
Schofield Pittsburgh, PA	+	+	+	+	+	1/2	+	1/2	Research

Codes:

- 0 = none of criteria
1/2 = some of present
+ = criteria present
- = not applicable

* See Bibliography B.

** Hsia and Norton and Hsia were treated as one study.

CHART 3
Range of Criteria for Community
Case Studies with Some Research Strength

Criteria	Number of Case Studies	None of Criterion present 0	Criterion Used	
			Some 1/2	Present +
1. A) Quasi-experimental	11	6	3	2
B) Experimental	11	0	0	0
2. A) Process--overtime in nature	11	3	3	5
B) Process--focus on integration	11	3	1	7
3. Variety of outcome measures	11	3	3	5
4. Complex, diverse effects	11	3	5	3
5. Multilevel nature	11	0	4	7
6. Causal analysis, even if speculative and tentative	11	1	4	6
7. Political perspective	11	1	3	7
8. Open criterion which proved imprac- tical excpet for inclusion of descriptive cases	11	11	11	11

CHART 4
Criteria Pattern for
Descriptive Community Case Studies*

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
		A	B						
Barnett San Francisco, CA	0	+	+	+	1/2	1/2	0	1/2	Good descrip- tive
Bouma northern city	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Campbell Norfolk, VA	1/2	-	-	-	-	-	+	1/2	Descriptive
Carrington Baltimore, MD	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Thesis abstract
Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools** - Boston, Denver, Detroit, Minneapolis	0	-	-	0	1/2	0	0	+	Good but brief
Coates Kalamazoo, MI	0	0	0	1/2	1/2	1/2	0	0	Good descrip- tive
Corwin Syracuse, NY	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Abstract of thesis
Egerton Memphis, TN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not a case study
Griffin Cincinnati, OH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not a case study
Grotberg Washington, DC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Innovation study
Harris** Inglewood, CA; New Haven; San Francisco; Little Rock; Waterloo, Iowa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Brief de- scriptive
Holden Charlottesville, VA Providence, RI Sacramento, CA	0	1/2	0	0	0	+	1/2	+	Descriptive and histor- ical
Huie Atlanta, GA	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Thesis abstract

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	33 8	
	<u>A B</u>								
Inger New Orleans, LA	Rewrite of section of Crain "Politics of School Desegregation"								
Jackson Lee County, FL	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Thesis abstract	
Knox D.C. Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Early 1957 case	
Kurtz Pasadena, CA	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	In house	
Lachat Greenburgh, NY	0	1/2	+	0	0	1/2	0	1/2	
Market Opinion Research --Pontiac, MI parents --Pontiac, MI teachers	0	1/2	0	0	0	0	0	In house study	
Marascuilo Berkeley, CA	0	1/2	+	0	0	0	0	Limited to student attitudes	
Renfro DeKalb County, GA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	Supt's role
Resource Management Corp.** 20 brief case studies	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	ESAP study
Sullivan Prince Edward Cty. VA	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	Participant observer
Tumin Greensboro, NC	1/2	0	-	0	0	-	+	0	Interviews and analysis
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights-- Boston, MA Colorado Springs, CO Corpus Christi, TX Kalamazoo, MI Los Angeles, CA Prince George's Cty, MD Springfield, MA 5 communities** 9 communities** 10 communities**	0	0	0	0	0	0	1/2	+	
Wilson Santa Ana, CA	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Thesis abstract
Williams** 23 mini studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	

Chart 4 - Page 3

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	34	8
		A	B						
Winston San Francisco, CA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	Plan Study
Working Together** 4 communities	Microfiche illegible								ESEA study

Codes:

x = not accessible
 0 = none of criteria
 1/2 = some of criteria
 + = criteria present
 - = not applicable

* See Bibliography B

** Eight mini-studies not analyzed on Chart 6

CHART 5
Range of Criteria for
Descriptive Community Case Studies

Criteria	Number of Case Studies*	None of Criteria	Criteria Used	
			Some 1/2	Present +
1. A) Quasi-experimental	38	28	2	0
B) Experimental	38	30	0	0
2. A) Process--overtime in nature	38	24	4	2
B) Process--integration	38	27	-	3
3. Variety of outcome measures	38	28	1	1
4. Complex, diverse effects	38	27	3	0
5. Multilevel nature	38	24	3	3
6. Causal analysis speculative, tentative	38	25	2	3
7. Political perspective	38	21	2	7
8. Open criterion	38	30	0	0

* 8 cases not available for examination

Introduction to Chart 6

We have designed Chart 6 to reflect the coverage of communities by case studies in our search findings. The author and date of the study are identified. Accessibility is determined by the form or type of material. Books, for example, are more accessible to the general public than microfiche material, and theses (available on microfilm by order) are least accessible. Forty-four cases are available in twenty-five books; seventeen cases can be read on microfiche; and five theses were not accessible except in abstracts. One monograph could not be obtained. Five cases are in process and cannot be assessed as to form or focus.

In the section of Chart 6 described as "Focus," we are attempting to illustrate the range of the community perspective. Descriptive studies and studies with some research strength are combined in Chart 6. Twenty-five "full" studies meet the parameters of "community case studies on school integration" either through rounded coverage of community factors, or through in depth analysis. In twenty-one "partial" studies not all the elements required for a community case study are present; but, the studies are very useful. While sixteen "limited" studies cover only a few factors in such studies they would fill in those areas in a total picture of the community experience. With eleven cases not accessible for analysis, the total cases analyzed equal seventy-one individual cases covered by forty-five actual studies. Fifty-three communities reflect this coverage in Chart 5.

Chart 6 on Coverage of Communities is not the sum of Chart 2 and Chart 4 studies. We did not analyze descriptive mini-studies according to communities, therefore, the figures do not tally with total number of cases evaluated.

CHART 6
Coverage of Committees

Community	Author	Date	Accessibility			Focus		
			Book	Micro-	Thesis	Limited	Partial	Full
Atlanta, GA	Huie	1967			305p	x	x	x
Baltimore, MD	Carrington Crain	1970 1968	1/10 of 390p		174p	x	x +	x
"Bayou County, Miss."	Mack	1963	1/10 of 473p				+	
Berkeley, CA	Gordon Marascuilo	1972 1972		37p 157p		+	+	
Birmingham, AL	Bynum	1974		188p			+	
Bloomfield, CT	Jablonsky	1973		98p			+	
Boston, MA	Crain (Bay City)	1968	1/10 of 390p				+	
	Ross	1977		In proc- ess		x	x	x
	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	1975	225p					+
	Willie	1977		In proc- ess		x	x	x
Buffalo, NY	Crain	1968	1/10 of 390p				+	
Charlottesville, VA	Holden	1974	1/3 of 500p					+
Chicago, IL	Mack	1963	1/10 of 473p					+
Cincinnati, OH	Griffin	1976		58p		+		
Colorado Spings, CO	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	1977	20p			+		

x = not accessible

Community	Author	Date	Acessibility			Focus		
			Book	Micro-	Thesis	Limi- ted	Par- tial	Full
Corpus Christi, TX	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	1977	107p				+	
Dallas, TX	Willie	1977?		In proc- ess		x	x	x
Dayton, OH	Killalea	1977?		In proc- ess		x	x	x
Dekalb County, GA	Renfro	1974	191p			+		
Durham, NC	Cotton	1974		129p			+	
Evanston, IL	Hsia Norton and Hsia	1971 1969	222p 39p			+		+
Ewing Township, NJ	Cotton	1974	150p				+	
Goldsboro, NC	Lachat Mayer	1973 1974		71p 113p			+	+
Greenburgh, NY	Lachat	1973		71p		+		
Greenfield, SC	Bagwell	1972	1/2 of 341p					+
Greensboro, NC	Bagwell	1972	1/2 of 341p					+
	Tumin	1958	270p				+	
Hempstead, NY	Mack	1968	1/10 of 473p					+
Inglewood, CA	Bonacich	1972	107p					+
Kalamazoo, MI	Coates Mack	1971 1968		100p 1/10 of 473p		+		+
	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	1977	22p			+		
"Lawndale"	Crain	1968	1/10 of 390p				+	
Lee County, FL	Jackson	1970			281p	x	x	x

Community	Author	Date	Accessibility		Focus	Full
			Book	Micro- Thesis	Limited	Partial
Los Angeles, CA	Mack	1968	1/10 of 473p			+
	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	1977	246p			+
Memphis, TN	Egerton	1973	35p		+	
Milwaukee, WI	Willie	1977?		In proc- ess	x	x x
Minneapolis, MN	Bynum	1974		133p		+
Newark, DE	Mack	1968	1/10 of 473p			+
Newark, NJ	Crain	1968	1/10 of 390p			+
New Orleans, LA	Crain	1968	1/10 of 390p			+
	Inger	1969	118p	- rewrite of above item by one of the researchers.		
Norfolk, VA	Campbell	1960	195p			+
Orangeburg, SC	Gordon	1972		33p	+	
Pasadena, CA	Kurtz	1975	326p		+	
Pittsburgh, PA	Crain	1968	1/10 of 390p			+
	Schofield	1976	Mss form			+
Pontiac, MI	Market Opinion Research	1975		114p	+	
Prince Edward Cty, VA	Sullivan	1970	221p			+
Prince George's Cty, MD	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	1976	464p			+
Providence, RI	Holden	1974	1/3 of 500p			+
"River City, Miss."	Mack	1968	1/10 of 473p			+

Chart 6 - Page 4
x = not accessible
Community

40

Community	Author*	Date	Accessibility**			Focus***		
			Book	Micro-	Thesis	Limi- ted	Par- tial	Full
Riverside, CA	Gerard Mack	1975 1968	315p 1/10 of 473p					+ +
Sacramento, CA	Holden	1974	1/3 of 500p					
St. Louis, MO	Crain	1968	1/10 of 390p				+	
San Francisco, CA	Barnett Crain	1972 1968	374p 1/10 of 390p				+	+
	Winston	1970		99p		+		
Santa Ana, CA	Wilson				406p	x	x	x
Savannah, GA	Mack	1968	1/10 of 473p					+
Springfield, MA	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	1976	50p			+		
Syracuse, NY	Beker Corwin	1967 1968	450p		396p	x	x	+ x
Washington, DC	Knox Grotberg	1957 1967	250p	48p		+ +		
53 communities	71 cases		44 cases	17 cases	5 cases	16	21	23

No. of communities: 53

No. of studies: 45 covering 71 cases

16 Limited focus

21 Partial focus

23 Full focus

11 Not accessible (5 in process)

71 cases

Book 25 studies
Microfiche 10 studies
Thesis 5 studies
In process 5 studies
45 studies

* 26 cases are mini-studies

** 5 cases in process, form not known

*** 11 cases not accessible (5 in process)

IV
ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDIES
WITH SOME RESEARCH STRENGTH*

Since our extensive search yielded such a sparse number of community-based case studies with some research strength, it becomes practical to review briefly each of these varied investigations individually. Charts 2 and 3 provide an overall evaluation of these eleven studies in terms of our eight initial comparison criteria. All meet at least a few of the criteria and, taken together, apparently constitute the thin research literature in community studies upon which such work in the future can be built. Therefore, we shall consider each of them in alphabetical order.

Bagwell

Though not published until 1972, Bagwell's research in Greensboro, North Carolina, and Greenville, South Carolina, focuses on the initial school desegregation decade, 1954-1965. Retrospective descriptions of the desegregation process in both cities are presented. The research aspects of the effort consisted of interviews with representative samples of leaders in each city in an effort to seek local

*See Bibliography B

opinion as to the importance of 25 factors in the desegregation process. These factors had earlier been agreed upon as significant by a panel of eight social scientists. Some differences in the ratings appeared between the two cities, but there was general agreement on the importance of four factors for the success of school desegregation: firm support from black leaders; pressure from local civil rights groups; firm official policy to support law and order; and the force (or threat) of court action.

Bagwell's process descriptions are useful, but this research effort is quite limited. The importance of various factors in a complex social process cannot be fully ascertained through such a rating method, as revealed in the triviality of the principal findings. Frankly, we include it here largely because of its focus upon Greensboro, North Carolina. This city began its public school desegregation early (September 1957) and without court order. Consequently, it has received frequent attention from social scientists--though the repeated investigations have been equally limited in scope (e.g., Tumin, 1958; Wey and Corey, 1959). Nonetheless, these studies taken together establish a useful baseline for a "twenty-years-later" followup look at desegregation in Greensboro. We shall return to this point in the next section of the report.

Beker

This lengthy, 458-page report evaluates in detail the initial steps in 1964 of Syracuse, New York, to desegregate its elementary and junior high schools. The formal conclusions of this study are restricted by its review of only one year, the limited degree of desegregation actually involved, the high attrition of students in critical experimental groups, and the lack of cooperation that the research received from the school system. Yet Beker and his colleagues still managed to provide an unusually candid, insightful, and valuable view of the process of desegregation in its inaugural year. (Race Mixing in the Public Schools by Charles V. Willie and Jerome Beker is a rewrite of this study published by Praeger, 1973.)

Though events beyond the control of the investigators impaired the project's original research design, the study at least illustrates many of our criteria for a useful study. (See Appendix I for criteria.)

Beker's work emphasized process and integration in an overtime study; it investigated a range of effects, including pupil interaction and community support in addition to achievement test scores; it provides a careful political perspective; and it intelligently speculates about causal paths and advances data at the community-parent, teacher, and pupil levels of analysis.

At the community level, the white community did not evince marked change over the year, but the black mothers of bused children developed strongly positive attitudes toward the effort. At the teacher level, the need for greater pre-desegregation training and preparation became evident. In addition, the potentially valuable services of "integrationist specialists"--playing an ombudsman-like role in each interracial school--was demonstrated despite the fact that the program was poorly supported by the school system. At the pupil level, increased student interaction across racial lines developed through the year at each of the schools studied. And, while subject attrition hindered the achievement test results, Beker concluded that no groups' scores were apparently lowered by the experience. He noted with particular interest that not even poor black children newly bused to a predominately middle-class white school with exceptionally high achievement scores had lowered scores--as speculated on by Armor (1972) and other critics of the school desegregation of the public schools.

Bonacich-Goodman

This modest study focused upon Inglewood, California, in 1969. Using demographic data, leadership interviews, and observations of public meetings, the researchers attempted to portray the conflict process generated by proposals for school desegregation. Their investigation did not directly

study the within-school desegregation process at all, for a districtwide plan was not begun until a year after the study was conducted.

Inglewood had long been an all-white suburb of Los Angeles. But the 1960s witnessed the introduction of black residents and the expansion of a large black ghetto of Los Angeles up to its borders. Like many similar inner-ring suburbs in large metropolitan areas, Inglewood has since received a disproportionate share of black families leaving the core city for better housing and services. This situation results from the growth of the black middle class, the intensity of housing discrimination practiced throughout the nation's metropolitan areas against black Americans, the consequent funneling of the pent-up black demand into a few specific areas like Inglewood where a "beach-head" is established. This direct consequence of racial discrimination necessarily makes the school desegregation process an unstable one. And it is this basically demographic instability to which Bonacich and Goodman address themselves.

The study documents the resegregation of Inglewood's schools, and systematically describes the demographic, educational, and political factors that undergirded this resegregation. It is almost entirely descriptive, and often repeats conventional wisdom on the subject of "white flight" without supporting evidence. We include it in this listing, however,

for two reasons. First, Inglewood furnishes an especially pointed instance of a community so caught in the midst of gross metropolitan demographic forces that local school and political factors are overwhelmed. Second, the Bonacich-Goodman work provides an additional and important case to the more extensive study of desegregation politics provided by Robert Crain and his colleagues.

Crain

This project was an ambitious, imaginative attempt with a low budget to examine the decision to desegregate made by the school boards of fifteen cities. Crain and his co-workers investigated eight northern (St. Louis, Newark, Buffalo, Baltimore, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Oakland, and Boston) and seven southern central cities (Miami, Jacksonville, Atlanta, Columbus, New Orleans, Baton Rouge, and Montgomery). They chose these cities by a modified random sampling scheme, defined the key variables, and set out to assign to each city scores on these standard variables so that survey-style analyses could later be employed. The data were gathered by stout-hearted bands of two or three interviewers that spent only a week or so in each area. Yet these research teams managed to interview most school board members, civil rights leaders, key civic leaders, and such local informants as journalists and social scientists.

Like the Bonacich and Goodman inquiry, the Crain project

centered upon the political process surrounding desegregation rather than the desegregation process in the schools themselves. Admittedly "quick-and-dirty" in some important methodological respects, this investigation nonetheless provides fifteen surprisingly insightful descriptive community "mini-studies." More important, its analyses employing each city as a unit led to valuable, if tentative, conclusions.

Crain analyzed the northern and southern city samples separately. In the North, the size of the black population, the liberalism and cohesion of the school boards, and the appointment (rather than election) of the board all related positively with school desegregation. In the South, these factors operated similarly as well as the additional demographic finding that predominantly white-collar cities (e.g., Miami and Atlanta) moved more positively than blue-collar ones (e.g., New Orleans and Jacksonville). For both regions, the level of strife and controversy eventually generated can be accurately anticipated by the nature of the school boards' "key response." When a board ignores initial protests and presents the image of unmoving, unresponsive resisters to change, escalation and intense conflict almost inevitably follow. And for those skeptics who regard social science as incapable of making significant and accurate predictions, one extension of this finding deserves

notice. Crain interpreted his late-1960s data as indicating major future strife and conflict in Boston, a prediction that proved all too correct a few years after his research.

Gerard and Miller

The school desegregation research in Riverside, California, is perhaps the most extensive yet undertaken in a single community. It began with high promise in 1966, for it boasted a large interdisciplinary staff of social scientists, generous financial support from the National Institute of Mental Health, and the cooperation of the Riverside school system. The tireless student of desegregation research, Meyer Weinberg, expressed this high promise when he wrote that the Riverside study, when completed, "will constitute a landmark in American social science" (Weinberg, 1970, p. 229). Yet since the publication of the full study in 1975, this research has hardly been hailed as "a landmark." Its critics maintain that it failed to exploit its unique advantages and shaped in part its negative results through inappropriate methods and theory. Its authors and supporters reply that the critics are politically biased and are just unhappy about its negative findings. It is not the purpose of this report to enter into this debate, much of which is now before the courts as its authors employ their results to

support continued racial segregation of the public schools of San Diego and Los Angeles. It is sufficient for our present purposes merely to outline the Gerard-Miller approach, its findings, and its principal strengths and weaknesses.

The Riverside School Study collected "premeasures" on 1,654 public school children in the spring of 1966. Postmeasures were collected in 1967, 1968, and 1969, partial postmeasures in 1970, and postmeasures on elementary pupils only in 1971. Anglo students comprised 39 percent of the first sample tested, blacks 23 percent, and Mexican-Americans 38 percent. This investigation benefits, then, from being one of the longest overtime community studies available. However, like most longitudinal research in a highly mobile area, heavy attrition occurred from 1966 to 1969: 35 percent of the Anglo, 36 percent of the black, and 19 percent of the Mexican-American samples were lost. And, since the entire district desegregated, there was no opportunity to have segregated control groups for comparison--a critical feature of strong quasi-experimental designs (Campbell and Stanley, 1966). A final problem involves the meagerness of the pre-desegregation measures. Only one pre-desegregation point was sampled, thus rendering it impossible to ascertain trends prior to the system's

desegregation. But, more serious, is the fact that 98 percent of the black and 76 percent of the Mexican-American children "pre-measured" in the spring of 1966 had already begun their desegregated experience; in other words, 85 percent of the minority children studied actually had no pre-desegregation measures.

The strongest feature of the Gerard and Miller work is the richness of its measured variables. The project utilized standardized achievement test scores, classroom grades, and measures of intellectual ability, peer group interaction, outgroup attitudes, feelings about self, emotional adjustment, achievement motivation, level of aspiration, and characteristics of the home. Conspicuous by their near absence, however, were measures of school structure. Unfortunately, too, most of the testing of the minority pupils was administered by middle-class Anglo testers--a potentially serious source of bias (Sattler, 1970, 1973). Data were also collected from parents and teachers.

The design of the Riverside project assumed strong ethnic differences in personality--in motivation, beliefs, and behavior--that in turn would account for interethnic differences in achievement. The study's "personality model," therefore, predicted that desegregation's effects would be mediated through personality changes. But this

model failed to be supported by the Riverside results. Desegregation appeared to the authors to have had only marginal and mixed personality effects; for minority children, anxiety tended to increase, self-esteem was little affected, while realistic goal-setting behavior tended to improve. Even more damaging to the "personality model" was the fact that most of the predicted relationships between personality measures and achievement did not emerge as expected for any of the three ethnic groups.

Though regrettably not the focus of the Riverside School Study, structural determinants of academic performance appeared stronger than personality determinants in the findings. Thus, teacher expectations proved uncommonly crucial.

In the classes of teachers who exaggerated the intellectual inadequacies of minority children, they [minority pupils] showed much larger decrements in verbal achievement test performance than did their peers in the classes of less biased teachers. Indeed, those in the classrooms of teachers low in discrimination showed slight gains in achievement. Moreover, it was the brightest minority children who seemed to suffer the most from the biased teacher (Gerard and Miller, 1975, p. 294).

Unfortunately, the project failed to make classroom observations in order to follow up these suggestive results.

Cross-ethnic choices for both friends and work partners declined overtime during desegregation. This revealing and disappointing fact about desegregation as it was instituted in Riverside would appear to explain at least some of the failure of the project to uncover other substantial changes after desegregation, for earlier studies have often shown the critical importance of cross-racial friendship as a mediation of other changes (e.g., U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967). Given these clear teacher bias and sociometric indications that Riverside's schools did not achieve integration during these years, it is hardly surprising to learn that the Riverside School Study found no evidence of a "total effect" of desegregation in enhancing achievement for any of the three groups of students--though declines were not noted either.

Rather different implications can be drawn from these data. Gerard and Miller themselves, not in their book but more recently as expert witnesses in desegregation court cases, are willing to generalize their results freely beyond Riverside. They apparently feel they demonstrated the general failure of desegregation, and consequently testify against extensive desegregation plans in cities as different from Riverside as San Diego and Los Angeles. And they

dismiss the fact that one major national investigation of desegregation's long-term effects (Crain and Weisman, 1972) obtained directly opposite results from theirs in part because of the possibility of biasing selection effects operating in the rival research. Yet the possibility of similar selection factors operating in who resides in Riverside is not raised.

But the results of the Riverside School Study can also be seen more narrowly and cautiously. Despite its interdisciplinary staff composition, the project was designed along restrictively psychological lines as to its guiding model, the variables measured, and the limited, laboratory-type methods of analysis. The total-effect fallacy, described earlier, is fully illustrated by this investigation. Did achievement go up or not for the three ethnic samples and why? This question pervades the study. But were there no effective interracial schools in Riverside? If there were, how did they differ structurally from less effective schools? No such school-by-school comparisons are reported. Such comparisons were especially indicated by the fact that the Riverside school district became more decentralized at the onset of desegregation. Moreover, the few intragroup comparisons made across teachers and classrooms did in fact reveal the strongest results of the entire investigation. Even if the research problems of the study are ignored and

its total effect findings are completely accepted, we are left knowing largely about Riverside's failures to achieve integration.

From the larger perspective of community studies generally, the Gerard and Miller work suggests that a trade-off often exists in the literature to date between a full-fledged research approach, on the one hand, and a wider and deeper sophistication about the process and structure of school desegregation, on the other. This apparent trade-off is not inevitable, however, as we shall shortly note in reviewing the Mayer et al. research on Goldsboro, North Carolina.

Gordon, Bynum, Cotton, and Lachat

This set of six studies stands as the opposite pole from the Riverside School Study. Using a methodology similar to that of Crain, Gordon and his Teachers College associates focused upon the process of educational desegregation in communities where programs were generally regarded to have been successful. Basically a descriptive, rather than an overtime-research, approach was followed in an effort to isolate across the six communities "major ~~and~~ process variables associated with progress toward ethnic desegregation in the public schools."

Background data were first assembled on each community.

And then trained teams visited the communities, observed schools, and conducted structured and unstructured interviews with administrators, teachers, students, parents, and community leaders. The communities investigated in this standardized manner were: Birmingham, Alabama; Durham, North Carolina; Ewing Township, New Jersey; Goldsboro, North Carolina; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Orangeburg, South Carolina. Funded by the National Institute of Education, the work was performed in the early 1970s. Successful desegregation, it was concluded, required careful "preparation, effective communications, firm policy enunciation and support, and educational innovations in service to children."

Chart 2 reveals that these largely descriptive studies meet only a few of our comparison criteria. We have included them in this list because they are carefully done, standardized descriptive studies upon which later research could be based.

Gordon and Brownell

This is another set of basically descriptive community studies carried out by the Teachers College group under Edmund Gordon. Sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, careful studies were made of seven compensatory education programs and the desegregation programs in Berkeley,

California, and Bloomfield, Connecticut (an inner-ring suburb of Hartford). The designs and conclusions of these two additional cases are similar to the six community studies directed by Gordon and described above.

Hsia and Norton and Hsia

In March 1968, the Board of Education of Evanston, Illinois, initiated an evaluation of its citywide program of racial desegregation. We have excluded in-house studies from our search but we include this investigation because it was contracted out to the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, with funds supplied by the Rockefeller Foundation. Program effects on teachers and parents as well as on students were sought. And the research extended for three years, ending in June 1971. The Norton and Hsia paper in 1969 was an interim report. Hsia issued this later and more comprehensive project report with findings in August 1971.

Chart 2 indicates that this inquiry is one of the strongest community studies uncovered in our search. It candidly describes Evanston's desegregation process. And it employs a tight quasi-experimental research design that, along with the Goldsboro evaluation, could well serve as a model for future community studies.

The Evanston results, like those of the Riverside research are subject to conflicting interpretations. The

basic findings are: (1) black and white children both registered achievement test gains during desegregation though these gains were not statistically significant; (2) since both racial groups gained, the so-called racial "achievement gap" did not close; (3) both black and white students' grades fell during desegregation, and there were no significant differences "in the frequencies of earned grades within each group" (Hsia, 1971); and (4) both black and white pupils in Evanston's third, fourth, and fifth grades who had previously been in predominantly black schools reported somewhat lower academic self-concept scores after two years in predominantly white schools (Weber, Cook, and Campbell, 1971; Hsia, 1971).

Armor (1972), in attacking school desegregation, selectively emphasized from these Evanston findings that the "achievement gap" had not closed and that black grades and academic self-concept scores had declined. He omitted mentioning the achievement gains of both groups and the comparable declines in white grades and self-concept scores. Other commentators conclude that the grading and self-concept shifts are simply a "social comparison effect" that reflects adaptation by both races to stricter norms and more realistic conceptions of academic performance; and that Evanston's desegregation accompanied a mild heightening of both academic standards and performance (Hsia, 1971; Pettigrew *et al.*,

1973; and Weber, Cook, and Campbell, 1971).

Mack

This detailed survey of nine communities was carried out in the mid-1960s as a companion to the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey (Coleman, 1966). Supported by the U.S. Office of Education, different investigators followed similar and coordinated procedures under the general direction of the race relations specialist, Raymond Mack. The communities were purposely selected to yield diversity by region, population size, and the status of educational desegregation: Kalamazoo, Michigan; Newark, Delaware; Riverside and Los Angeles, California; Savannah, Georgia; so-called "River City" and "Bayou County" in the delta area of Mississippi; Chicago, Illinois; and Hempstead, New York.

These investigations were intended to be descriptive in nature, to "put flesh on the bones of the survey data by learning something from observation and unscheduled interviews about definitions of situations and the interactional contexts of the data sought by survey methods" (Mack, 1968, p. xi). But "hard data" are employed more extensively and systematically than in the greater majority of the descriptive community studies uncovered in our search. The contrasting racial situations of the various

communities made necessary somewhat different approaches; but each utilizes relevant and available "hard data" with which to structure their interview and observational data. And results from Coleman's national survey are interwoven with the community data in the useful summary chapter by Mack.

The overview conclusions drawn by Mack stress the structural determinants of school segregation. Huge metropolitan areas, North and South, were even then resegregating; and the success of desegregation in all of the nine communities surveyed was noted to be directly shaped by the structural conditions that locally applied to the process.

Mayer, King, Borders-Patterson, and McCullough

Though little known, this evaluation research of desegregated schools in Goldsboro, North Carolina, is perhaps the most complete and competent community-based research study now available. It includes the strong features of both descriptive and research investigations and it could serve as a model for future investigations. Observe, too, that in Chart 2 it meets all of the criteria we advanced earlier as desirable.

It is tempting to compare the contrasting results of this study with those of the Riverside School Study, but

the comparison is made difficult by two significant differences. First, the Goldsboro investigation employs a tighter quasi-experimental design and was conceived in a broader social perspective. For example, achievement tests were administered at two time points prior to system-wide desegregation (in September of 1968 and of 1969) as well as three points following desegregation (in September of 1970, April 1971, and April 1972). Hence, trends both prior to and after the intervention are possible to ascertain. And an interview study of the community's power structure together with an extensive description of the community's desegregation process inform the "hard data" analyses. Finally, a "structural model," as opposed to a "personality model," guided the study and led to detailed data on classroom interaction between teachers and students being collected by systematic classroom observations.

A second difference lies in the contrasts between the two cities and their desegregation processes. An hour's drive east of Los Angeles, Riverside had an estimated 133,000 residents in 1965 when the desegregation research began. Its school system was overwhelmingly middle-class white along with 6 percent black and 10 percent Mexican-American children. By comparison, Goldsboro lies in the flat, agricultural black belt of North Carolina, had in 1970 only 27,000 residents with over half of its school system comprised of black pupils.

Yet, surprisingly, this small, traditional southern city began in 1970 a far more complete and equitable desegregation plan than that of Riverside's a few years before.

The Goldsboro findings are strikingly more positive than those of Riverside. Sample results give the flavor: black elementary pupils participated in classroom discussions far more for competent, racially mixed, team-teaching staffs; younger and black teachers were far more optimistic about educational achievement than older and white teachers; balanced interracial curriculum materials in the high school course on American history proved important; high school students felt optimistic about working out racial problems despite racial tensions; and, consistent with Crain's findings, Mayer and his colleagues found that the elitist, monolithic structure of Goldsboro's leadership and its control over the appointed Board of Education made possible the sweeping and thorough nature of the city's school desegregation program.

In particular contrast with Gerard and Miller's results, Mayer et al. found significant gains in national achievement percentiles that appeared to be traceable to the desegregation process itself. Both black and white elementary students rose in percentile scores on both verbal and mathematics tests between the third and fifth grades following two years of desegregation. Moreover, control comparisons indicated that these

gains were not simply due to maturation, to changed teaching styles, or to social class effects. At the high school level, the researchers found that (1) desegregation did not harm white achievement; (2) desegregation "accompanied" an arrest of the downward trend in achievement scores among blacks under segregation; (3) the difference between the black and white high school students in reading percentiles partly closed and the widening racial difference in mathematics percentiles under segregation was arrested; (4) high achievers of both races revealed continuous improvement throughout the study period, with improvement accelerating under desegregation; (5) white low achievers revealed continuous decline before and during desegregation, but the decline of black low achievers was arrested under desegregation.

These more encouraging results in Goldsboro no more "prove desegregation works" than the opposite results in Riverside "prove desegregation fails." The results are limited to the special situations under investigation. The two studies do suggest, however, that critical structural and political factors can make the process "work" relatively well in unlikely places and not work well in far more promising locales.

Two further methodological points are raised by the Goldsboro investigation that we feel are important to note

for future community-based evaluation studies. First, Mayer et al. employ an innovative Markov process technique together with their five tested points to overcome the regression problems of longitudinal research mentioned earlier. The power of this analysis, as opposed to the one partial pre-desegregation measure of the Riverside School Study, leads to conclusions that would have otherwise been misinterpreted. For instance, the Goldsboro finding that desegregation arrested the decline in low-achieving black pupils' achievement scores was made possible only by knowing the declining trend prior to desegregation. The same data with only one testing point prior to desegregation would have indicated only that no change in achievement percentiles had occurred under desegregation.

The second point concerns the definition of a "test gain." Mayer and his associates express disappointment that Goldsboro's desegregation did not occasion a large closing of "the achievement gap" between the city's black and white students. Some minor "closing" did tend to occur; but we regard this measure as an unrealistic and inappropriate definition of a "gain." The so-called "gap" did not significantly close because, with the onset of desegregation, Goldsboro's schools significantly improved the test performances of both whites and blacks (save for

low-achieving white pupils in the high school). Is this not an indication of solid success? The "racial gap" could have been closed by no percentile change for blacks and a steep drop for whites--hardly an acceptable indicator of desegregation's success. For those concerned with "gaps" in academic attainment for later life chances, the relevant comparison needs to be kept in mind. For the most part, Goldsboro's blacks will be competing later in the labor market against whites other than their classmates. And this is why the percentile gains on national (largely white) norms are especially meaningful: Goldsboro's black and white pupils both closed the more critical "gap" between them and the nation's larger pool of talent.

Schofield

Strictly applied, our exclusion of one-school studies would exempt Schofield's contribution. Yet we include it here, because we regard it as a model for detailed investigations of the critical process within interracial schools of achieving genuine integration.

Funded by the National Institute of Education, Schofield meticulously studied one "nearly integrated" middle school in Pittsburgh. She calls her approach "ethnographic" in that it involves "detailed observation of ongoing interaction"

placed within the perspective of its institutional context. Her research team concentrated on the sixth grade and extensively observed classrooms, teachers' meetings, and special school events. Once a week a racial and sexual map was made of the lunchroom's seating patterns for the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. Even wall posters and bathroom graffiti were duly noted. And student and faculty attitudes were systematically measured. Schofield aimed all of these efforts primarily at obtaining "a broad picture of the experiences which students and staff have in school," evaluating how well the school approached the theoretical structural criteria for true integration, and recording the developing interracial patterns of association and friendship among students.

"Wexler" middle school is a lavishly equipped new structure that has effectively acted as a "magnet" in attracting a wholly voluntary enrollment. It was intended to be a model integrated school in an otherwise deeply segregated urban educational system. And its enrollment through administrative selection has been maintained at approximately half of each race. Obviously, then, Wexler is no "typical" urban school. But it is an ideal setting in which to learn about that which we still know so little--the actual process of integration.

We have available to us only Schofield's interim report of May 1976 following her first year of research. Her initial

findings are too rich to record here, though one result from her lunchroom maps can be cited briefly. Wexler's sixth grade structure approaches that held by integration theorists to be ideal; and, as predicted, seating patterns over the 1975-76 school year for the sixth grade did indeed become significantly more racially mixed. But the eighth grade experiences considerable ability tracking and some consequent racial separation; and, as predicted again, seating patterns for the eighth grade did not become more racially mixed over the year.

V

CONCLUSIONS ON THE STATE
OF THE ART OF COMMUNITY CASE STUDIES

Several conclusions concerning community studies of school desegregation can now be stated on the basis of our bibliographical search and review. Three of the conclusions describe "the state of the art"; a fourth points to further work in the future.

"The State of the Art"

Though limited as to both time and resources, we believe that our brief search is complete enough to advance three summary statements concerning the present "state of the art" of relevant community-based studies.

(1) There are a number of community studies of public school desegregation but they consist predominantly of purely descriptive reports of widely varying quality. The initial hypothesis that a great many community-based investigations of school desegregation had been conducted proved essentially incorrect in both sheer numbers and in quality. Purely descriptive studies, which by far outnumbered the more research-oriented studies, tended to be either mini-studies or studies limited in perspective, and they did

not reflect the criteria adequately. There was 50 case studies altogether; 38 were descriptive: 7 of these were less than fifty pages; 8 of these were mini-studies; 8 were not accessible, and only 13 were adequate. Therefore, our cursory substantive analysis of the literature consequently had to be rendered in two separate sections--one for the descriptive, another for those with some research strength.

The descriptive reports vary sharply in quality, purpose, and direction. We found some of them interesting and valuable, especially so for future investigators who, we hope, will wish to do further work in these same communities. Nonetheless, this extreme variance in quality restrains their cumulative impact through replication upon our understanding of the desegregation process.

(2) The relatively few research-oriented community studies also vary widely in quality. Even our thorough search and the adoption of gentle standards for inclusion into the category of research-oriented community studies still led to only eleven projects. And our reviews of each of these studies uncovered once again wide variance in quality, purpose, and direction. This variance appears to be more a function of the research sophistication of the investigators than of differential research resources and opportunities across the diverse communities. Thus,

the three most carefully designed inquiries (Mayer et al., Hsia and Norton and Hsia, and Schofield) did not benefit from grants as large as some of the other examples cited. And virtually all eleven of these investigations received adequate cooperation from local school authorities.

Both the scarcity and the varying quality of the stronger investigations mitigate against an effective use within desegregation research at present of Campbell's "cottage-industry model." Recall that Campbell's alternative to single, massive national evaluation studies requires a large array of diverse studies of reasonable quality (Campbell, 1971, 1974, 1975a, 1975b, 1977). Before "selective retention" can effectively take place from community studies, there must be widespread (if not true random) variation of many localized investigations meeting most of our criteria. We shall return to this point in the final section of the report on suggestions for future work.

(3) The research-oriented community studies are strongest on the comparative criteria concerned with an adequate political perspective, a focus upon integration, and attention to the multi-level nature of the process. They are weakest on such criteria as an adequate quasi-experimental design and attention to differential effects

across different aggregate units.

Chart 2 reveals the strengths and weaknesses of the eleven studies classified as having some degree of research strength. We were surprised that many of them had focused upon the integration process, rather than just looking at desegregation per se. And they typically invoked a political perspective from which to view the school process as well as consideration of the fact that the process takes place at numerous levels (typically at least teachers and students were both considered). But we were not surprised to find that most of these eleven investigations could boast neither an adequate quasi-experimental research design nor a differentiated analysis that went beyond "the total effect fallacy" described earlier.

While some would wish, perhaps, to add a few more criteria to our list, we believe our literature search and review confirms the utility of our criteria as a comparative checklist:

- (a) Applied gently and flexibly, the criteria did not prove too impractical and rigorous for distinguishing and rating a wide range of investigations.
- (b) The criteria did in fact differentiate between the various investigations uncovered--first,

to separate the research-oriented from the descriptive studies, and second, to distinguish among the studies within each of these two categories.

- (c) Our review failed to uncover any additional criteria that persistently emerged and could have aided in the ordering and evaluation of the studies.
- (d) It is apparently possible on reasonably modest research budgets to meet in part or in whole all of the criteria, as demonstrated in the Goldsboro, Evanston, and Pittsburgh inquiries. We suspect the elaborate Riverside School Survey, which did not measure up as highly on the criteria, cost considerably more than these three studies combined. Obviously, a certain threshold of support is required to meet the criteria, yet careful prior planning and design appear to be the more crucial factor.
- (e) Rather than mere "obsessive niceties" to please methodologists, these criteria do delineate those investigations whose findings are of greater theoretical and policy significance.

This last point concerning the special value of these few research-oriented investigations that do meet the criteria deserves further discussion. It is especially critical in a controversial policy area such as school desegregation that evaluation research eliminate as many "threats to validity" and "plausible rival hypotheses" as possible (Campbell and Stanley, 1966). We regard each of our first seven criteria as relevant to this need. For example, the results of an evaluation of any particular school district's desegregation program can often be explained in terms of the larger political setting in which the program takes place. Only if the political perspective criterion is met can such an interpretation be properly appraised.

Let us return to the comparison between the Riverside (Gerard and Miller) and the Goldsboro (Mayer et al.) projects to illustrate the necessity for a fully adequate quasi-experimental design--perhaps the most critical of our criteria. Recall that the Goldsboro investigation found for a number of student groups that school desegregation was accompanied not by a rise in achievement test scores but by a definite arresting of a sharp trend downward under racial segregation. Recall also that this finding was made possible by Mayer's robust design of two achievement testings prior to desegregation that allowed for the

determination of pre-desegregation trends. No such design was employed in Riverside. Indeed, we noted earlier that the one "pre-intervention" testing actually occurred after 85 percent of the minority sample had already begun desegregation.

So a perfectly "plausible rival hypothesis" arises to account for Riverside's failure--in the aggregate-- to lift test scores after desegregation. Instead of Gerard and Miller's conclusion that desegregation in Riverside (and elsewhere) fails, one could reasonably maintain that a trend downward for minority achievement test scores had probably been in progress before desegregation was initiated, as it typically is in segregated schools. And, like Goldsboro's results, Gerard and Miller's results demonstrate that desegregation in Riverside successfully arrested this decline. Such a possibility actually fits with many of the Riverside School Study's published findings. But in truth we can no more fairly evaluate this "plausible rival hypothesis" than we can the interpretation of Gerard and Miller. Their incomplete pre-intervention testing simply does not allow us to decide between the two highly divergent accounts.

In short, though not necessarily more expensive to follow, meeting these criteria does achieve explanatory power that is useful to practitioners, policy makers, and

social scientists alike. To argue for the value of these criteria for meaningful research-oriented community studies, however, is not to discount the contribution of historical, descriptive studies of public school desegregation. This is why we have recorded and briefly evaluated the descriptive community-based investigations that our search turned up. This reasoning also explains why we believe a solid historical and descriptive perspective is necessary even for the more research-oriented inquiries. Campbell (1974) once again states the case:

If multiple independent anecdotes are to be trusted, the computers too often have been processing in stolid seriousness worthless data produced by children who are staging mass boycotts, or deliberately sabotaging the process or making jokes out of their answers. Anecdotes of similar scandals are available for questionnaires, attitude scales, and interviews. . . . We need such critique to be integrated with quantitative study. At the present time there is a little relating of these two approaches, although not enough. Some of this integration is at least called for in the methodology of field experimentation, under the headings of "threats to validity" or "plausible rival hypotheses." . . . A qualitative

consideration of the differing contexts of measurement often generates hypotheses as to how differences between pretest and posttest, or between experimental and control group, are due to differences in the respondent's or researcher's understanding of the measurement process. rather than to changes in the attribute which the measure is intended to reflect. Some of these rival hypotheses can be ruled out by formal aspects of design, but many of them must remain qualitative even in the most thorough report: in the mode of generating the rival hypothesis, in seeking out other evidence of that hypothesis' validity, and in the overall judgment as to its plausibility. ... In current quantitative program evaluations, qualitative knowing is regularly present in the narrative history of the program, as well as in the description of the program content, the measures and means of data collection, and in the verbal summary of program outcomes. The numerical evidence would not be interpretable otherwise. Yet such qualitative content is often an unplanned afterthought (Campbell, 1974, pp. 14-15).

The Future of Community Studies of School Desegregation

A fourth summary conclusion emerges from our search and review in regard to future community-based research on

school desegregation.

(4) Two strengths of the present literature could benefit future and higher quality community studies of public school desegregation:

- a. There are some communities that have been repeatedly studied in the past that suggest themselves for future work, with the earlier work serving as baseline observations for the development of valuable and needed long-term examinations of the impact of the process.
- b. There are a few superior studies that meet virtually all of our criteria and could well serve as models for future community-based inquiries.

Chart 6 presents the supporting data for the first of these claims. It shows the studied communities in alphabetical order, the investigators' names, the study dates, the accessibility of the studies, and each study's focus. For our present purposes, it is important to note the number of communities that more than once have had their school desegregation situation either investigated in the past or under investigation presently: Baltimore (twice), Berkeley (twice), Boston (four times), Goldsboro, N. C. (twice), Greensboro, N. C. (twice), Kalamazoo, Michigan (three times), Los Angeles (twice), Pittsburgh

(twice), Riverside, Calif. (twice), San Francisco (three times), Syracuse (twice), and Washington, D. C. (twice). And Chart 6 understates the amount of material available to researchers, for we have excluded masters and doctoral dissertations with five exceptions as well as in-house studies from our listings. Using this earlier work as benchmarks, future community studies could skillfully develop a truly long-term view of the process. The typical community study now available is a snapshot, cross-sectional look; those studies that are longitudinal typically inspect one or at the most two years; and the Riverside and Goldsboro studies are conspicuous in their spread over four to five years.

Yet a few major policy programs are judged or should be judged over a few months. In fact, a long-term perspective over a decade or more might well yield a picture radically different from any presently available through short-term community studies of desegregation. We suspect--on the basis of what is known of southern communities that have experienced school desegregation for more than a decade--that the long-term view would be considerably more positive than the short-term views tempered by initial disruptions, etc. But the point is that we can only suspect, we cannot be certain, because such work has yet to be performed. However, the material, qualitative

and quantitative, does exist to be exploited for these needed purposes.

Greensboro, North Carolina, offers an illustration of the point. Melvin Tumin (1958), the Princeton sociologist, conducted a small study in Greensboro in which 287 white male members of the labor force were asked their attitudes about racial desegregation of the local schools. Later, as we reviewed in Part IV, Bagwell (1972) also investigated Greensboro more generally. A follow-up study of the city now, then, could build on Bagwell's largely qualitative analysis as well as repeating Tumin's survey questions two decades later. Our search suggests that Greensboro is not unique, that similar opportunities await the energetic researcher in numerous communities.

The second claim is based on the investigations of Goldsboro, Evanston, and Pittsburgh reviewed in detail in Part IV. These researchers could serve as models for how the criteria can be met, with the Goldsboro and Evanston studies illustrating strong community-based inquiries over-time and the Pittsburgh study illustrating a strong single-school inquiry of student interaction and the integration process.

Our search and review thus concludes that:

- a. There is a need for high-quality, long-term

community studies of school desegregation that provide both qualitative description and quantitative research meeting the criteria set forth earlier.

- b. There exists now both the foundation (earlier work) and the design (research models) for such needed community investigations.

Only if we were to obtain such studies that exploit the strong foundation and designs can the realm of desegregation research benefit from a "cottage-industry model" of evaluation. And we join Donald Campbell in believing that such a model of evaluation is a sorely needed supplement to the gross national studies performed on the process to date--from the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey of 1966 to the recently completed national evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act conducted by System Development Corporation. These sweeping, large-scale evaluations are useful in providing national "maps" of a phenomenon, in pointing to particular variables and problems of general importance. They establish the agenda for future, detailed research by raising important questions without the precision to answer them. Witness in particular the watershed effect of the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey on such matters as social class climates of schools

and the importance of home learning environments as well as school desegregation.

But fine-grained research at the community level is also required if we are to understand such a complex process sufficiently for wise social policy. Hence, we close our report by specifying three advantages possessed by the cottage-industry model of numerous community investigations that have been touched on briefly earlier in the report.

- a. Repeated community investigations can cross-validate critical results with different researchers using different instruments in diverse settings. Such cross-validating is the common means by which natural science "selectively retains" important new results, but social science in general and evaluation work in particular rarely benefit from it.
- b. Community studies can combine "qualitative knowing" with quantification better than nationwide research. Campbell (1974) and others constantly emphasize that intelligent quantification requires "qualitative knowing" available only to persons close to the program and data. Just as community studies need national studies as guides

and maps, so, too, do national studies need community studies for their qualitative underpinnings as well as quantitative specification.

- c. These points assume special force for today's general educational issue of seeking methods that best transform merely mixed schools into effective, integrated institutions. The evaluation of such specific procedures particularly lends itself to the cottage industry model. To quote Campbell:

"What we need . . . is a contagion of imitative experimentation in which everybody is trying out alternatives continually. If someone hits on anything hot, then this is cross-validated through being imitated by many other people who continue to keep records on it to see whether it really does work. In experimental social science, many hot results turn out to be false positives. . . . The experimental procedure, the bookkeeping, the reality testing need to be continued by those who borrow a hot idea as well as by those who innovate it. We need to continue this bookkeeping, so that, in the cumulative and public record of such

experiments, a viable applied science can grow" (Campbell, 1971, p. 172).

Bibliographies

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

Armor, D. J., "The Evidence on Busing," The Public Interest, Summer 1972, No. 28, 90-126.

Campbell, D. T., "Administrative Experimentation, Institutional Records, and Nonreactive Measures," W. M. Evan (ed.), Organizational Experiments: Laboratory and Field Research (New York: Harper & Row, 1971) p. 169-170.

-----"Qualitative Knowing in Action Research," The Kurt Lewin Award Address, Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Meetings in New Orleans, September 1, 1974.

-----"Reforms as Experiments," E. L. Struening and M. Guttentag (eds.), Handbook of Evaluation Research (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1975a), p. 71-100.

-----"Assessing the Impact of Planned Social Change," G. M. Lyons (ed.), Social Research and Public Policies (Hanover, N. H.: The Public Affairs Center, Dartmouth College, 1975b), p. 3-44.

-----William James Lectures, 1977 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, in press).

-----and A. Erlebacher, "How Regression Artifacts in Quasi-Experimental Evaluations Can Mistakenly Make Compensatory Education Look Harmful," E. L. Struening and M. Guttentag (eds.), Handbook of Evaluation Research (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1975), p. 597-617.

-----and D. W. Fiske, "Convergent and Discriminant Validation by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix," Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 81-105.

-----and J. C. Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966).

Coleman, J. S., E. Q. Campbell, C. J. Hobson, J. McPartland, A. M. Mood, F. D. Weinfeld, and R. L. York, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

- Cook, S. W., "Desegregation: A Psychological Analysis," American Psychologist, 1957, 12, 1-13.
- Crain, R. L., and C. S. Weisman, Discrimination, Personality and Achievement: A Survey of Northern Blacks (New York: Seminar Press, 1972).
- Hsia, J., Integration in Evanston, 1967-1971 (Evanston, Ill.: Educational Testing Service, 1971).
- Pettigrew, T. F., "Social Psychology and Desegregation Research," American Psychologist, 1961, 16, 105-112.
- "The Negro and Education," I. Katz and P. Gurin (eds.), Race and the Social Sciences (New York: Basic Books, 1969).
- E. L. Useem, C. Normand, and M. S. Smith, "Busing: A Review of the Evidence," The Public Interest, Winter 1973, No. 30, 88-118.
- Sattler, J. M., "Racial Experimenter Effects in Experimentation Testing, Interviewing, and Psychotherapy," Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 137-160.
- "Racial Experimenter Effects," K. S. Miller and R. M. Dreger (eds.), Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States (New York: Seminar Press, 1973).
- Tumin, M. M., Desegregation: Resistance and Readiness (Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1958).
- Weber, S. J., T. D. Cook, and D. T. Campbell, "The effect of School Integration on the Academic Self-Concept of Public School Students," unpublished paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association, Detroit, 1971.
- Weinberg, M., Desegregation Research: An Appraisal (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, May 1970).
- Wey, H., and J. Corey, Patterns in School Desegregation; A Guide Book (Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1959).

B.

COMMUNITY CASE STUDIES WITH
SOME RESEARCH STRENGTH

- Bagwell, William, School Desegregation in the Carolinas:
Two Case Studies (Columbia, S. C.: University of
South Carolina Press, 1972) 341 pp.
- Beker, Jerome, and Charles V. Willie,* A Study of Integra-
tion in Racially Balanced Urban Public Schools: A
Demonstration and Evaluation, Final Report (Syracuse,
N. Y.: Syracuse University Youth Development Center,
1967) 450 pp.
[Sponsoring Agency, U.S. Office of Education and Na-
tional Institute of Mental Health]
- Bonacich, Edna, and Robert F. Goodman, Deadlock in School
Desegregation: A Case Study of Inglewood, California
(New York: Praeger, 1972), 107 pp.
- Crain, Robert L., The Politics of School Desegregation, Na-
tional Opinion Research Center Monographs in Social
Research (Chicago: Aldine, 1969), 390 pp.
[Sponsoring Agency, U.S. Office of Education]
- Gerard, Harold Benjamin, and Norman Miller, School Desegre-
gation: A Long-term Study (New York: Plenum Press,
1975), 315 pp.
- Gordon, Edmund W., and others,* A Comparative Study of
Quality Integrated Education, Final Report (New York:
Columbia University, Institute for Urban and Minority
Education, 1976), 691 pp.
[Sponsoring Agency, National Institute of Education]

Available Sections of Above Study

- Bynum, Effie, and others, Desegregation in Birmingham,
Alabama: A Case Study (New York: Columbia University
Teachers College, 1974), 188 pp.
- Cotton, Oscar, and others, Desegregation in Durham,
North Carolina: A Case Study (New York: Columbia Uni-
versity Teachers College, 1974), 129 pp.

-----Cotton, Oscar, D, and others, Desegregation in Ewing Township, New Jersey: A Case Study (New York: Columbia University Teachers College, January, 1974), 150 pp.

-----Lachat, Mary Anne, Desegregation in Goldsboro, North Carolina (New York: Columbia University Teachers College, June 1973), 71 pp.

-----Bynum, Effie M., and others, Desegregation of the Minneapolis Public Schools, Minneapolis, Minnesota: A Case Study (New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1974), 133 pp.

-----Gordon, Edmund W., and others, Desegregation: Orangeburg, South Carolina (New York: Columbia University ERIC Clearing House on the Urban Disadvantaged, 1972), 33 pp.

Gordon, Edmund W., and Carolyn Ralston Brownell,* Preparation of Publications on Progress in Complementary Education and Desegregation Programs, Final Report (New York: Columbia University, 1972), 459 pp.
[Sponsoring Agency, U.S. Office of Education]

Available Sections of Above Study

-----Gordon, Edmund W., and others, Desegregation: Berkeley, California (New York: Columbia University, ERIC, Clearing House on the Urban Disadvantaged, 1972), 37 pp.

-----Jablonsky, Adelaide, and others, Status Report of School Desegregation in Bloomfield, Ct. (New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1973), 98 pp.

Hsia, Jaygia,* Integration in Evanston 1967-71: A Longitudinal Evaluation (Evanston: Midwestern Office, Educational Testing Service, August 1971), 222 pp. [Norton, Hsia examined here].

Mack, Raymond W., Our Children's Burden: Studies of Integration in Nine American Communities (New York: Random House, 1968), 473 pp.

Mayer, Robert B., and others, The Impact of School Desegregation in a Southern City (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1974), 113 pp. [Goldsboro, N. C.].

Norton, Daniel, and Jaygia Hsia,* Evaluation of Integration of Evanston District 65 Schools, Interim Report (Princeton: Educational Testing Services, 1969) 39 pp. [See Hsia for analysis].

Schofield, Janet Ward, "Ethnographic Study of a 'Nearly Integrated' Urban Middle School," (Unpublished report, May 26, 1976).
[Sponsoring Agency, National Institute of Education.]

*Authors thus marked are available in ERIC documents on microfiche.

C. Descriptive Community Case Studies

- Barnett, Saul, and others,* Evaluation of San Francisco Unified School District Desegregation/Integration, 1971-1972 (San Francisco, Calif.: San Francisco State College, 1972), 374 pp.
- Bouma, Donal H., and James Hoffman, The Dynamics of School Integration: Problems and Approaches in a Northern City (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Co., 1968), 587 pp.
- Campbell, Ernest G., When a City Closes Its Schools (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1960) 195 pp.
- Carrington, Joel Acus, The Struggle for Desegregation of Baltimore City Public Schools, 1952-1966 (Baltimore: University of Maryland, 1970) 174 pp.
- Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools, Citizen's Guide to Desegregation: A Report of the Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools (Cleveland: The Council, 1976), 45 pp.
- Coates, William D.,* Kalamazoo Public Schools (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1971), 100 p.
- Corwin, Ronald David, School Desegregation in Syracuse: A Study in Community Decision-Making (Syracuse: Syracuse University, 1968), 396 pp.
- Egerton, John, Promise of Progress: Memphis School Desegregation, 1972-1973 (Atlanta: Southern Regional Council, 1973), 35 pp.
- Griffin, Virginia K., and others,* "Symposium: Strategies for Achieving Racial Balance in the Cincinnati Public Schools," paper presented at American Education Research Association Meeting, April 21, 1976, 58 pp.
- Grotberg, Edith H.,* Progress Report of the Washington Integrated Secondary Education Project: Addendum II (Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, School of Education, 1967), 48 pp.
- Harris, Norene, Nathaniel Jackson, and Carl E. Rydingsword, The Integration of American Schools: Problems, Experiences, Solutions (Boston: Allyn & Beacon, 1975), 331 pp.
- Holden, Anna, The Bus Stops Here: A Study of School Integration (New York: Agathon Press, 1974), 500 pp.

- Huie, Henry Mark, Sr., Factors Influencing the Desegregation Process in the Atlanta School System, 1954-67 (Atlanta: University of Georgia, 1967), 305 pp.
- Inger, Morton, Politics and Reality in an American City: The New Orleans School Crisis of 1960--A Monograph (New York: Center for Urban Education, February 1969), 118 pp.
- Jackson, James Wm., A History of School Desegregation in Lee County, Florida (Coral Gables: University of Miami, 1970), 281 pp.
- Knox, Ellis O., Democracy and the District of Columbia Schools: A Study of Recently Integrated Public Schools (Washington, D.C.: Judd & Detweiler, 1957), 250 pp.
- Kurtz, Harold, The Educational and Demographic Consequences of 4 years of School Desegregation (Pasadena: Pasadena Public Schools, 1975), 326 pp.
- Lachat, Mary Anne,* The Dimensions of Integration in Greenburgh Central No. Seven, Greenburgh, N.Y. (New York: Columbia Teachers College, November 1973), 71 pp.
[Sponsoring Agency, U.S. Office of Education]
- Marascuilo, Leonard A.,* Follow-Up Study of Student Attitude Toward School Reorganization of the Public Schools of a Northern City, Final Report (Berkeley: University of California, January 1972) 157 pp.
[Sponsoring Agency, U.S. Office of Education]
- Market Opinion Research Company,* Parent Attitudes in the Pontiac (Michigan) School District Toward the Public Schools and Desegregation by Busing (Detroit: Market Opinion Research Company, 1975), 78 pp.
- Teacher Attitudes in the Pontiac, Michigan School District Toward the Public Schools and Desegregation by Busing (Detroit, Market Opinion Research Company, 1975) 36 pp.
- Renfro, Joe, No Room For Compromise (Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1974), 191 pp.
- Resource Management Corporation, Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, Vol. III, Appendices (Fethesda: Resource Management Corp., Vol. III, Appendices, Feb. 15, 1972) 782 pp.

- Sullivan, Neil V., Bound for Freedom (Boston: Little Brown, 1945), 221 pp.
- Tumin, Melvin Marvin, Desegregation: Resistance and Readiness (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958), 270 pp.
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Desegregating the Boston Public Schools: A Crisis in Civic Responsibility (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, August 1975), 225 pp.
- , The Diminishing Barrier: A Report on School Desegregation in Nine Communities (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, December 1972), 64 pp.
- , Five Communities: Their Search for Equal Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, December 1972), 55 pp.
- , A Generation Deprived: Los Angeles Desegregation (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977), 246 pp.
- , A Long Day's Journey into Light: School Desegregation in Prince George's County (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, March 1976), 454 pp.
- , School Desegregation in Colorado Springs, Colorado (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, February 1977), 20 pp.
- , School Desegregation in Corpus Christi, Texas (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, May 1977), 107 pp.
- , School Desegregation in Kalamazoo, Michigan (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, April 1977), 27 pp.
- , School Desegregation in Ten Communities (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, June 1973), 235 pp.
- , The Six District Plan: Integration of the Springfield (Mass.) Elementary Schools (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, March 1976), 50 pp.
- U.S. Office of Education, * Working Together: Case Studies of Title I--ESEA Programs in Four Desegregated School Districts (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1974), 117 pp.

Williams, Robin M., Jr., and Margaret W. Ryan, Schools in Transition: Community Experiences in Desegregation (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954), 272 pp.

Wilson, Joan Barbara Reiner, Racial Imbalance: School District Policy Making (Los Angeles: University of California, 1972), 406 pp.

Winston, Judith,* Desegregating Urban Schools: Educational Quality/Equality in San Francisco Public Schools: A Report (Washington, D.C.: The Council of the Great City Schools, September 1970), 99 pp.

*Authors thus marked are available in ERIC documents on microfiche.

D. BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESOURCES

Bibliographies of School Integration

Jablonsky, Adelaide, Comp., School Desegregation and Organizations: An Annotated Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations (New York: Columbia University, ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged, 1975), 193 pp. (Sponsoring Agency: NIE-DHEW).

-----, School Desegregation: An Annotated Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations (New York: Columbia University, ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged, 1973), 142 pp.

National Institute of Education, The Desegregation Literature: A Critical Appraisal (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, DHEW, 1976), 160 pp.

-----, School Desegregation in the 1970s: Problems and Prospects (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, DHEW, 1976).

Venditti, Frederick P., School Desegregation Research (Knoxville: College of Education, University of Tennessee, Bureau of Educational Research and Service, University of Tennessee, 1973), 69 pp.

Weinberg, Meyer, Desegregation Research: An Appraisal (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, May 1970), 460 pp.

-----, Minority Students: A Research Appraisal (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977).

-----, School Integration: A Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1967), 137 pp.

Xerox University Microfilms, A Bibliography of Doctoral Research on the Negro, Supplement, 1967-1969 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Xerox University Microfilms, 1969), 31 pp.

Books and Journal Articles with Bibliographies

- Bagwell, William, School Desegregation in the Carolinas, Two Case Studies (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1972), 341 pp.
- Crain, Robert L., The Politics of School Desegregation, National Opinion Research Center Monographs in Social Research (Chicago: Aldine, 1969), 390 pp.
- Mack, Raymond, Our Children's Burden: Studies of Desegregation in Nine American Communities (New York: Random House, 1968), 473 pp.
- Orfield, Gary, The Reconstruction of Southern Education: The Schools and the 1964 Civil Rights Act (New York: Wiley, 1969), 376 pp.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F., et al., "Busing" A Review of the Evidence," The Public Interest, 1973, pp. 88-115.
- St. John, Nancy Hoyt, School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children (New York: Wiley, 1975), 236 pp.

E. In-House Case Studies

- Blanchard, Walter J.,* "Inner City Providence: Implications for Education, Attachment 2" (Providence, R.I.: Providence Public Schools, Rhode Island College, 1967).
- Dade County Public Schools,* "Desegregation, September 1973" Report N2, Vol. XXI Administration Research (Miami, Fla.: Dade County Public Schools, 1973), 101 pp.
- Goldberg, Herman R., "Desegregation of the Elementary Schools," Special Report to the Board of Education (Rochester, N.Y.: City School District, February 1967).
- Graves, Marian F., and Frederick D. Bedell, "A Three-Year Evaluation of the White Plains Racial Balance Plan" (White Plains, N.W.: White Plains Public Schools, Oct. 16, 1967).
- Hendrick, Irving G., "The Development of a School Integration Plan in Riverside, California: A History and Perspective" (Riverside: University of California, September 1968).
- Hooker, Clifford P., and Van D. Mueller,* "Equal Treatment to Equals: A New Structure for Public Schools in Kansas City and St. Louis Metropolitan Areas" (Jefferson City: Missouri School District Reorganization Committee, June 1969), 72 pp.
- Kellner, Norman J.,* "A Study to Determine the Effectiveness of Open Enrollment and Busing as Solutions for the Social Segregation in the San Diego City Schools: A Report" (San Diego: San Diego City Schools, 1970).
- McCloud, Paul I.,* "Neither Black nor White: A Progress Report on Integration in the Tulsa Public Schools" (Tulsa, Okla. Tulsa Public Schools, 1974), 14 pp.
- Pavlish, Alfred, and David Kazan,* "How Pontiac Teachers View Their Schools" (Pontiac, Mich.: City School District, August 1972), 49 pp.
- Purl, Mabel C.,* "The Achievement of Pupils in Desegregated Schools" (Riverside: Riverside Unified School District, 1971).

- ,* "The Riverside School Integration Study: Introduction, Period Survey and Teacher Questionnaire" (Riverside: Riverside Unified School District, 1970), 59 pp.
- , and Jonathan Curtis, "Analysis of the 'Questionnaire on Experience of Elementary School Teachers with School Desegregation, September 1966 to March 1968'" (Riverside: Riverside School Study, January 1970).
- , and Harry Singer,* "A Study of Desegregation in the Public Schools, Riverside, California," Riverside School Study Progress Report, 1968-69, Project No. M8-14 (Riverside: University of California, Riverside Unified School District, March 15, 1969), 94 pp.
- "Survey of Parent Attitude Toward Schools" (Riverside: Riverside School Study, January 1970).
- Rochester City School District,* "A Three-Year Longitudinal Study to Assess a Fifteen-Point Plan to Reduce Racial Isolation and Provide Quality Integrated Education for Elementary Level Pupils," Final Report and Abstract (Rochester, N.Y.: Rochester City School District, September 1970).

*Authors thus marked are available in ERIC documents on microfiche.

Appendices

APPENDIX I

THE COMPARATIVE CRITERIA

1. Does the study employ a "reasonable" research design of either an experimental or quasi-experimental nature?
2. Does the study emphasize process rather than simply static phenomena?
 - A. Is the study overtime in nature?
 - B. Does the study focus on issues of integration in addition to mere mix and desegregation?
3. Does the study utilize a variety of outcome measures (i.e., dependent variables) rather than one outcome--such as achievement test score changes?
4. Does the study emphasize complex and diverse effects of disaggregated sub-units (e.g., classrooms or schools) as opposed to "total effects" of entire program?
5. Does the study reflect an appreciation of the multi-level nature of public education--the community, the school system, the classroom, and, finally, the individual student?
6. Is there any attempt--even if crude, speculative and tentative--to employ causal analysis (if at all warranted by the research design)?
7. Does the study provide any political perspective on the process of racial desegregation in the particular community? And, if not, would it be possible to obtain it now after the fact?
8. Finally, if a particular study does not reflect any of these comparative criteria, what criteria does it reflect and what do they still contribute to the "state of the art" of community investigations on school desegregation?

APPENDIX II

CASE STUDIES IN PROCESS

National Institute of Education

1. NIE has financed a study by Willis Hawley, the exact nature of this contract is not known.
2. NIE has also financed a study by Charles V. Willie of the School of Education, Harvard University, for a report on ten communities. The grant is for a period of two years at a cost of \$160,000. The project will examine the social and political processes that communities experience when confronted with a court order. The study will cover three cities: Boston, Dallas, and Milwaukee--each with a population of over one-half million-sized cities, with a population of less than 250,000. One rural area will be included.
3. J. Michael Ross of Boston University and William M. Berg have done Part I, "The Boston School Segregation Crisis: An Historical and Narrative Account." Part II, an overtime in nature study based on interviews before, during, and after Phase I, will be ready in the fall of 1977. This represents the only real community case study found in the search for Boston.

Office of Education

Stanford Research Institute has received a grant from the Office of Education to conduct multiple case studies. J. Neil Killalea of Killalea Associates is a consultant on the project. Dayton, Ohio is receiving full research attention in the summer of 1977. San Francisco has also been selected for study. The remaining case studies will be in districts for which some earlier and basic studies are available. Three of four such communities are to be selected in the fall of 1977.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Twenty-nine case studies or monographs have been in

preparation for publication. Three of these--Colorado Springs, Colorado; and Corpus Christi, Texas; and Kalamazoo, Michigan--are complete and listed under Descriptive Case Studies, Appendix IV.

Twenty-six will be published soon, among these are: Raleigh County, W.Va.; Waterloo, Iowa; Santa Barbara, Calif.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Greenville, Miss.; Erie, Pa.; Ossining, N.Y.; Ogden, Utah; Portland, Oreg.; Kirkwood, Mo.; Temple, Ariz.; Providence, R.I.; Williamsburg City, S.C.; Wichita, Kans.; Tacoma, Wash.; Dorchester County, Md.; Springfield, Mass.; Newport News, Va.; Bogalooosa, La.; Nashville, Tenn.; Berkeley, Calif.; Little Rock, Ark.; Racine, Wis.; Stamford, Conn..

Rockefeller Foundation

Dr. Robert L. Green, Dean of the College of Urban Development, is to undertake a three-year study, with a potential for five years, on the desegregation/integration of New Castle County, Delaware. Wilmington is the center of this county; therefore, this will be the careful analysis of the first metropolitan solution. The grant amounts to \$375,000.

The study research design meets a number of Pettigrew's criteria. It is quasi-experiemntal and overtime in nature, with a strong pattern for the examination of integration or interracial attitudes. Variety of outcome measures, multiple effects, and the multilevel nature are considered in the design. Causal analysis is certainly one of the goals of the Green study. However political perspective seems to be absent.

APPENDIX III
Forty Communities Which
Have Experienced School Desegregation

Community	Historical Record	Geographic Range	Demographic Spread	Mode of Operation	Comment
Austin, Tex.*	1970	West	City	Court ordered	Limited by Nixon Adminis- tration
Berkeley, Calif.**	1968	West	City	Voluntary	Supt. & Board
Boston, Mass.**	1965-74 1974	East	Urban	Admin. enforced Court ordered	Mass. Bd. of Ed./NAACP case
Chapel Hill, N.C.*	---	South	---	---	Consultant recommended
Charlotte, N.C.**	1971	South	Urban & County	Court ordered	Swann v Charlotte Mecklenburg
Chicago, Ill.**	1965	North	Urban	Admin. enforced	HEW failure in North
Columbia, S.C.	---	South	---	---	Consultant recommended
Dade County, Fla.**	---	South	Urban & County	Court ordered	Metropolitan
Dallas, Tex.*	---	West	---	---	Consultant recommended

Community	Historical Record	Geographic Range	Demographic Spread	Mode of Operation	Comment
Denver, Colo.*	1976	West	Urban	Court ordered	Keys v. School District #1
Detroit, Mich.**	1970	North	Urban	Court ordered	Bd. of Ed. supported but recalled
Evanston, Ill.**	---	North	City	Voluntary	
Houston, Tex.	---	West	---	---	Consultant recommended
Jackson, Miss.**	---	South	City	Court ordered	Historic case
Jackson, Mich.*	---	North	---	---	Consultant recommended
Little Rock, Ark.**	1958	South	City	Court ordered	Cooper v. Aaron
Louisville, Ky.**	---	South	Urban-suburban	Court ordered	Classic case
Los Angeles, Calif.**	---	West	Urban	Voluntary	---
Manhasset, N.Y.* (Long Island)	---	North	---	---	---
Memphis, Tenn.*	---	South	---	---	Consultant recommended
Minneapolis, Minn.**	1974	North	Urban	Admin. enforced/ Reinforced by Court order	Bd. of Ed. and Supt.
Mobile, Ala.*	---	South	---	---	Consultant recommended
Nashville, Tenn.*	---	---	---	---	Consultant recommended
New Bedford, Mass.*	1973	North	Sm. City	Admin. enforced	Mass. Bd. of Ed.

Community	Historical Record	Geographic Range	Demographic Spread	Mode of Operation	Comment
New Orleans, La.*	1956	South	Urban	Court ordered/ Reinforced by community pressure	Schools closed then reopened
Norfolk, Va.*	---	South	---	---	Consultant recommended
Oklahoma City* Okla.	---	West	---	---	Consultant recommended
Pasadena, Calif.*	1970	West	Urban	Court ordered	Struggle continuing
Pontiac, Mich.**	1970	North	Urban	Court ordered	NAACP agent
Prince Edward County, Md.**	1964	South	County	Cour ordered	Closed public schools Griffin case
Racine, Wis.*	---	North	---	---	Consultant recommended
Riverside, Calif.**	1965	West	Urban	Voluntary	---
Rochester, N.Y.	---	North	---	---	Consultant recommended
St. Louis, Mo.**	1963-65	South	Urban	Voluntary	Bd. with community support
San Francisco,	1965	West	Urban	Volun	
San Francisco, Calif.**	1965	West	Urban	Voluntary	NAACP suit; negotiation
Tampa, Fla.* (Hillsborough County)	1971	South	Urban & county	Court ordered	Community involvement
White					

Community	Historical Record	Geographic Range	Demographic Spread	Mode of Operation	Comment
White Plains, N.Y.*	---	North	---	Voluntary	Consultant recommended
Wilmington, Del.*	---	---	Urban & suburban	Court ordered	---
Winston-Salem, N.C.*	---	South	---	---	Consultant recommended

**most important

* second order

no asterisk - third order

APPENDIX IV

COMMENTS BY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

"You've done a creditable search. You've discovered enough to be able to make a feasibility judgment and you have come up with very nice results. . . As I read through it this time, I was wondering if, in setting up those criteria, we would be accused of setting up a self-fulfilling prophecy - that is, that we set up so many type criteria that no case studies could respond to it. Clearly this was not true. There were cases that did. So it shows that the criteria can be applied and they were applied. That is exactly what the feasibility study was to show.

"The study points out that there is not an awful lot of good social science knowledge for an area that is as important as this. It is very thin gruel in terms of good defensible studies. There is a need for community case studies to be done.

"If it doesn't take a lot of money to meet these criteria, why not indicate whether cost is the limiting factor in the research strength of a case study?

"Lots of community areas are not covered. There is still a need to do a comprehensive series and to initiate some new case studies. What you have gives you a base line, too valuable to lose. Additional research is also needed on existing case histories.

"It's an interesting piece of work."

Gregory R. Anrig
Commissioner of Education
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Boston, Massachusetts

[Comments from tape of July 7, 1977 meeting of the Advisory Committee on NIE Feasibility Study]

"The Feasibility Study demonstrates that which has been unsystematically "known" by educators, lawyers and others who have been working on the issues, namely, that most of the research work done heretofore is, to varying degrees, of course, of questionable validity and very limited usefulness.

"So little to show for the expenditure of substantial time, money and energy is academically disappointing, to be sure. However, there have been two other consequences even more harmful: first, partisan advocates of various persuasions have seized upon unsupported conclusions and fragmentary or misleading data to support their predetermined conclusions; and secondly, conscientious policy makers--educators, legislators at all levels and judges, to the extent that social science data influence the legal process--have been handicapped in their efforts to base their policy decisions upon reliable data.

"On that basis, while the Study is extremely promising as it stands now, I have two brief suggestions. Part V of a subsequent draft, or even a separate prospectus-type document, might well describe in greater detail how our methodology will avoid or overcome the problems and shortcomings of existing studies. Secondly, I believe we should emphasize that we hope to provide substantial and impeccable work, not only for the social science academic community, but for policy makers and their purposes as well."

J. Harold Flannery
Foley, Hoag & Eliot
Boston, Massachusetts
Counsel on Boston Case

"I am sorry to have been out of town for the July 7, 1977 meeting of the Advisory Committee on the NIE Feasibility Study. I am particularly sorry to have missed the discussion and so offer the following comments as my own untutored observations after reading the available drafts.

"I find Part V of the Report very persuasive, as well as being well written and clear. While I agree with the thesis on pages h-j that long range studies are necessary, let me put in a plug for short term aspects of studies. The crises that have arisen in the first few years of desegregation in certain areas may be accounted for by certain factors which, if identified, could be eliminated or tempered in areas newly undergoing desegregation. The studies should be of some assistance to those who must implement desegregation orders. They would benefit from an identification of some of the short term "mistakes" made in the past.

"This concern is related to another, perhaps minor, comment I have on the criteria for selection of studies. There should be some concern with the comparison of the precise topics of the various studies. It is perhaps too broad a criteria to simply say that they are all studies of desegregation without identifying those aspects of desegregation that are the focus of the studies."

Sandra L. Lynch
General Counsel
Massachusetts Department of
Education
Boston, Massachusetts

"From the point of view of the historian, the descriptive community case studies are historical studies...It would be a mistake, therefore, to restrict our interpretation of history merely to retrospective study of communities that have been best studied by social scientific means. If that is so, then the descriptive studies, which are not very rigorous by social science standards, still are valuable for historians... They enable us to build up a much larger picture consistent with the rigor of any historical study.

"Such descriptive cases answer most significant historical questions... The essential thing that the historian of this subject has to deal with is to provide an explanation of why things happened as they did. Therefore, research should go beyond special communities and strong research cases to the purely descriptive but historically informative cases. ... Design for future studies should have a firm place for this material which is so relevant to the historical perspective."

Meyer Weinberg
Editor and Publisher
Integrated Education
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

[Comments from tape of July 7, 1977 meeting of the Advisory Committee on NIE Feasibility Study]